

# ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

INTO

## PRIMARY EDUCATION (IRELAND).

---

VOL. IV.

---

CONTAINING

### EVIDENCE

TAKEN

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS

FROM NOVEMBER 24th, 1868, TO MAY 29th, 1869.

*Questions and Answers 17069 to 27648.*

---

*Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.*

---



DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY ALEXANDER THOM, 87 & 88, ABBEY-STREET,  
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1870.

[C.—6. III.] Price 5s. 9d.





# CONTENTS OF VOL. IV.

## WITNESSES EXAMINED.

	Page		Page
<b>Forty-sixth Day—Tuesday, November 24, 1868.</b>		<b>Fifty-fifth Day—Friday, December 4, 1868.</b>	
Mr. Daniel Macdonough, teacher of Naas National School, County Kildare, . . . . .	777	The Very Rev. James Byrne, A.M., Dean of Clonfert, . . . . .	947
<b>Forty-seventh Day—Wednesday, November 25, 1868.</b>		The Very Rev. Lawrence Canon Toole, further examined, . . . . .	956
Rev. John Scott Porter, Presbyterian Minister (Non-entailing), Belfast, . . . . .	789	The Rev. John McMeekin, D.D., Stranorlar, County Donegal, . . . . .	960
<b>Forty-eighth Day—Thursday, November 26, 1868.</b>		<b>Fifty-sixth Day—Saturday, December 5, 1868.</b>	
Mr. Charles Mathews, teacher of Strabane National School, County Tyrone, . . . . .	800	James Wm. Kavanagh, Esq., further examined, . . . . .	973
Rev. James Porter, Presbyterian Minister, Kilmarnock, . . . . .	812	<b>Fifty-seventh Day—Monday, December 7, 1868.</b>	
<b>Forty-ninth Day—Friday, November 27, 1868.</b>		Rev. James Tobin, Wesleyan Minister, Secretary to Wesleyan Conference, . . . . .	991
John Gordon, Esq., one of the District Inspectors of Schools under the Commissioners of National Education, . . . . .	818	James Wm. Kavanagh, Esq., further examined, . . . . .	996
Mr. Patrick Gallagher, teacher of Drumkeeran National School, County Leitrim, . . . . .	830	<b>Fifty-eighth Day—Tuesday, December 8, 1868.</b>	
<b>Fiftieth Day—Saturday, November 28, 1868.</b>		The Very Rev. Monsignor Lawrence Forde, D.D., one of the Vicars-General of the Roman Catholic diocese of Dublin, . . . . .	999
James William Kavanagh, Esq., formerly one of the Head Inspectors of Schools, under the Commissioners of National Education, further examined, . . . . .	836	<b>Fifty-ninth Day—Wednesday, December 9, 1868.</b>	
<b>Fifty-first Day—Monday, November 30, 1868.</b>		James Duffy, Esq., Publisher, Dublin, . . . . .	1027
The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, . . . . .	853	James Wm. Kavanagh, Esq., further examined, . . . . .	1028
Mr. Patrick O'Callaghan, teacher of Ovens National School, County Cork, . . . . .	860	<b>Sixtieth Day—Thursday, February 11, 1869.</b>	
<b>Fifty-second Day—Tuesday, December 1, 1868.</b>		Henry Mulock Pilkington, Esq., Q.C., Hon. Secretary of the Sunday School Society of Ireland, . . . . .	1042
Stephen de Vere, Esq., J.P., Chairman of Rathkeale Board of Guardians, County Limerick, . . . . .	871	<b>Sixty-first Day—Friday, February 12, 1869.</b>	
<b>Fifty-third Day—Wednesday, December 2, 1868.</b>		The Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, further examined, . . . . .	1046
The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Ossory, . . . . .	892	<b>Sixty-second Day—Saturday, February 13, 1869.</b>	
The Very Rev. William Atkins, D.D., Dean of Ferns, . . . . .	906	The Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, further examined, . . . . .	1058
The Very Rev. William Wambles, D.D., Dean of Ely, . . . . .	912	<b>Sixty-third Day—Monday, February 15, 1869.</b>	
<b>Fifty-fourth Day—Thursday, December 3, 1868.</b>		The Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, further examined, . . . . .	1070
Richard Williamson, Esq., Surveyor and Architect to the Honorable the Irish Society, . . . . .	919	J. Lowry White, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, . . . . .	1077
The Very Rev. Lawrence Canon Toole, D.D., St. Wilfrid's, Hulme, Manchester, . . . . .	927	<b>Sixty-fourth Day—Tuesday, February 16, 1869.</b>	
		The Right Hon. Mountfort Longfield, M.P., formerly one of the Judges of the Incorporated Estates Court, Ireland, . . . . .	1085
		William Hume Nevill, Esq., LL.D., one of the Secretaries to the Commissioners of National Education, further examined, . . . . .	1098

	Page		Page
SIXTY-FIFTH DAY—Wednesday, February 17, 1869.		Edward Sheehy, Esq., one of the District Inspectors of Schools under the Commissioners of National Education, . . .	1164
William Herman Nowell, Esq., M.D., further examined, . . .	1107		
—			
SIXTY-SIXTH DAY—Thursday, February 18, 1869.		SIXTY-NINTH DAY—Monday, February 22, 1869.	
THOMAS W. Allist, Esq., M.A., Oxon., Secretary to Catholic Poor School Committee of Great Britain, . . .	1126	His Eminence, Cardinal Cullen, . . .	1177
—			
SIXTY-SEVENTH DAY—Friday, February 19, 1869.		SEVENTH DAY—Tuesday, February 23, 1869.	
Cornelius Mahony, Esq., one of the District Inspectors of Schools under the Commissioners of National Education, further examined, . . .	1142	THOMAS O'HARA, Esq., one of the District Inspectors of Schools under the Commissioners of National Education, . . .	1204
John G. Richardson, Esq., patron of Bessbrook National School, . . .	1142	William Herman Nowell, Esq., M.D., further examined, . . .	1212
Rev. John Winthrop Hickott, Incumbent of St James's Church, Bray, and Secretary of the Incorporated Society, . . .	1145	THOMAS H. CRIGG, Esq., Clerk in the Office of the Commissioners of National Education, . . .	1217
—			
SIXTY-EIGHTH DAY—Saturday, February 20, 1869.		SEVENTEENTH DAY—Wednesday, February 24, 1869.	
John Binstock, Esq., M.A., one of the Professors at the Training Department, Marlborough-street, Dublin, under the Commissioners of National Education, . . .	1155	His Eminence, Cardinal Cullen, further examined, . . .	1219
—			
		SEVENTY-SECOND DAY—Thursday, February 25, 1869.	
		His Eminence, Cardinal Cullen, further examined, . . .	1247
—			
		SEVENTY-THIRD DAY—Saturday, May 29, 1869.	
		JAMES H. OWEN, Esq., Architect to the Board of Works, . . .	1267

FORTY-SIXTH DAY.—DUBLIN, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1868.

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of DOWRAGES, &amp;c., in the chair.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLOREDOCK.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, &c.,  
WILLIAM BROOKE, Esq., &c.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, &c.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, &c.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEASE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASTENTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., &c.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., &c., }  
D. R. DUNNE, Esq. } *Secretaries*

Mr. DANIEL MACDONOUGH sworn and examined.

No. 24, 1868.

Mr. Daniel  
Macdonough

17600. The Earl of Downages.—You are a National school teacher?—I am.

17610. Where is your school?—At Naas, in the county Kildare.

17611. For how many years have you been a teacher under the National Board of Education?—Twenty-two years. I have been nearly eighteen years in Naas.

17612. In the same school?—Yes.

17613. Was that the first school in which you were a teacher under the National Board?—No, my lord, I taught two country schools previously in the county Meath.

17614. Do you not represent here an association of National school teachers?—The association for Leinster honoured me by requesting me to come and give evidence for them before this Commission.

17615. To represent their views on certain matters affecting their own position as teachers?—Yes, on certain matters connected with their own position.

17616. Will you state, as briefly as you can, the matters respecting which the teachers complain?—I will, with your permission, read a short statement.

My LORDS AND GENTLEMEN.—On the part of the National teachers of Leinster I beg to return thanks for the kindness you have exhibited to me promptly acceding to the prayer of the memorial which was presented to you, asking the favour that you would before closing your labours be pleased to examine some of the schoolmasters, who are naturally anxious that you should hear from one of themselves as respects of their position, and the very inadequate, as they conceive, remuneration which they receive for their labours.

We are aware that in the discharge of your duties you have examined clerical men, commissioners, inspectors, governors, and managers of schools, and other gentlemen interested in primary education in this country, every one of whom was capable of giving you valuable information on that important subject; but we hope you will not deem us unreasonable or presumptuous for holding the opinion that none of these gentlemen could so truly or accurately describe the teacher's position as one of the teachers themselves, assuming, as we believe, we are right in doing that you allow, that to have primary education placed on a satisfactory footing in Ireland it is necessary that the teachers of National schools should receive a fair remuneration for their services; that they do not do so at present I am here respectfully to show.

Many of the facts and statistics which I, on the part of my brethren, am about to submit to you, have perhaps been already brought under your notice by those gentlemen examined by you, as well as ascertained by your Assistant-Commissioners, but your kindness in accepting to receive and allow some of the working men to state their case as best they can, will have I am sure you, a most beneficial effect on the whole teaching body, who are under the impression, whether rightly or wrongly (but that the impression prevails there can be no doubt), that their case has not yet received that amount of attention and consideration, either on the part of the public or the Government, which they believe it is entitled to.

That the state of education among the mass of the people of Ireland is not in an satisfactory condition as might be wished, will surprise no one who is aware of the fact that the average salary of the National teachers who comprise the great bulk of the primary teachers is a sum from all sources of about twelve shillings per week, on account not equal to that earned by a common day labourer, and which,

I am sure, will be admitted by every one to be totally inadequate to support teachers in that position in life which they ought to occupy.

To me other subjects only do I wish to call the attention of your lordships and the other Royal Commissioners, namely, the necessity of having retiring pensions provided for the teachers; so that after a period of thirty years' service, or thereabouts, the schoolmaster who has faithfully discharged the duties of an office, which all must allow is a laborious and exhausting one, should have in the evening of life a provision made for him by the State, as it has already generously done in the case of every other class of civil servants. At present the only course open to teachers who conscientiously feel that through age and infirmity they can no longer fulfil the duties which they undertook and discharged faithfully towards the public whilst health and energy lasted, is to endeavour to obtain a retiring allowance which the Board humanely gives to the amount of, at most, one or two years' salary. On the other hand, he is often allowed through a feeling of humanity on the part of managers and inspectors to remain in charge of a school long after he arrives at that period of life at which he is unable to satisfactorily perform his duties to the public advantage.

In the first case the teacher, after a short time, is pestered with an incessant bad disposition; in the second the public service suffers, and the poor worn-out man works on till exhausted nature fails, and he is sent from the school to his home to die, as it is said, in harness.

17617. When you say the pay of a teacher amounts to about 12s. a week, do you state that as the average for the different classes of teachers?—Yes; it includes the Board's grant and what is received from all other sources. Speaking of averages, we must recollect there are more below the average than above it. The number of third class teachers is greater than the number of first or second class teachers.

17618. You have in your calculation added to the Board's salary the emoluments from various sources?—Yes, from school fees and all other sources.

17619. Mr. Staines.—In striking the average, do you include mistresses as well as masters?—I do.

17620. The Earl of Downages.—With reference to pensions, I understand that what you wish is to have annual pensions granted instead of lump sums?—Yes.

17621. What is about the amount usually given in a lump sum at present as a retiring allowance?—It never exceeds, I think, the amount of two years' salary. Even that is not an absolute rule of the Board. A teacher cannot claim that. The Board's regulation on the subject is, that in some cases they will make allowances to teachers when leaving.

17622. Mr. Gibson.—Can you state the different rates of payment made by the Board to teachers in the shape of salary or gratuity since the commencement of the system?—I could state them in a general way, but not accurately.

17623. You say the average payment is about 12s. a week?—Yes; according to the Commissioners' report for 1866.

17624. What do you make that for the year?—Something about £35 or £35 a year.

5 G

Vol. 24, 1888.  
—  
Mr. Daniel  
MacDonagh.

17620. How much of that is subscribed by the pupils?—There is only 1s. 1d. annually from each pupil, taking the total number on the rolls. The total number of individual pupils attending the schools divided into the amount subscribed from local sources gives about 1s. 1d., or thereabouts, for each child.

17621. Master Brooke.—Do you mean 1s. 1d. weekly, or annually?—For the whole year. Not for the average attendance, but for the number of individual pupils on the rolls.

17622. Mr. Gibson.—The average attendance is about a third of the number on the rolls?—Yes.

17623. That would make the sum for the actual attendance three times greater?—Something about that; three times that amount.

17624. What is the actual number of children you say on the rolls that gives the average of 1s. 1d. per annum?—913,080 odd.

17625. Master Brooke.—Is 1d. for each child?—Yes, for each child.

17626. Mr. Gibson.—How many teachers are there in the employment of the Board?—There are 4,753 male teachers, 3,960 females.

17627. How many of those are classed teachers, and how many probationers?—There are 639 of the male teachers and so on. These we call "probationers." There are 507 females probationers.

17628. Now taking in the first instance the teachers, whether classed or unclassed, tell me the aggregate amount they receive from the Commissioners of Education?—Of the Government grant the Commissioners pay to the teachers £192,457.

17629. What average does that give to each of the teachers?—Something about £24 annually.

17630. That is the average paid to all?—Yes.

17631. What is your own standing as a teacher?—I am twenty-four years a teacher.

17632. What class are you in?—The highest grade of first.

17633. May I take you to be a sample of the first class teachers, enjoying the highest amount of emolument received from the Board?—I think you may.

17634. What are your emoluments from the Board, from various sources, including the school fees?—I have given you the average for all classes of teachers taken together. I receive £53 class salary, £13 for good service, and there is a varying allowance of £3 or £4 for teaching incidents.

17635. Rev. Mr. Cress.—What is the total you receive from the Board?—£67.

17636. Sir Robert Kane.—The school-fees are to be added to that?—Yes.

17637. What do your school-fees usually amount to?—About £30 a year.

17638. Your total income from your school would be about £100 a year?—Close on that.

17639. The Earl of Desborough.—What is the number on the rolls of your school?—About 270 or 280.

17640. Sir Robert Kane.—Is it usual in the district with which you are acquainted, for the managers to supplement in any way the salaries of teachers, so as to obtain the services of teachers of a class superior to the class they would otherwise have?—I know some instances of that, and I know some managers who have endeavoured to obtain some extra local endowment in order to obtain the services of high class teachers, but, in most instances, those local contributions to supplement the school-fees, fall to the ground, after some time.

17641. Those cases are exceptional?—They are exceptional.

17642. They are not frequent?—They are not.

17643. Mr. Gibson.—What class were you placed in when you entered the service of the Board?—We all enter as probationers.

17644. Tell me the rates of increase you received from the time you first entered the service of the Board?—Indeed the difference is very large. The first year I was in the service of the Board I received only £8 as a probationer.

17645. Can you say what a first class teacher

received when you entered the service of the Board, and what he receives now?—He received only £30. There were only three classes without any divisions at that time. The highest class man received only £30.

17651. Is it not the fact that from time to time the Board has made very considerable additions to the payments made by the State to the teachers?—Very considerable indeed.

17652. The rate of payment depends upon the classification of teachers?—It does.

17653. Is it not in the power of any teacher to rise from an inferior class to a higher class, according as he shows proficiency in examination?—Theoretically it is.

17654. What is there to prevent any young man entering first division of third class to obtain first division of first class?—He might be a very efficient teacher, and not be able to answer a sufficient number of questions at an examination.

17655. Whether does it depend upon himself or the State, that he does not rise up to the first class. Is the door not open?—Oh, indeed it is.

17656. Have you passed through many grades yourself?—I have passed every rung of the ladder.

17657. Supposing a teacher to enjoy good health, and to have his mind devoted to the duties of his office, and his attention, such as it ought to be, in there anything to prevent him from rising?—There is the smallness of the attendance in the school, no matter what his qualifications may be, if he have not more than an average attendance of thirty-five, he is not eligible for promotion to the first class.

17658. That rule was made recently?—It is in operation five years or more.

17659. That rule was not in operation when you joined?—It was not. That is one of the matters we complain of; such rules, introduced long after we entered the service, are considered an injustice to teachers of long standing.

17660. In such cases, could not deserving teachers, by improving themselves, rise in class?—Naturally so.

17661. Do you find a difficulty in conducting a school so as to have an average of thirty-five?—It is impossible in some places; I know it to be the fact.

17662. Does that arise from want of population, or from locality to the system in particular districts?—In every case I know of it arises from want of population.

17663. Then you think the schools are rather more numerous than they ought to be?—I think the most of the schools with which I am acquainted, were established before the population came down to its present number.

17664. What remedy would you suggest so as to remove the impediment which the smallness of the average attendance places in the way of a young man rising?—We cannot create children where they are not to be had.

17665. But where there are two schools in a locality?—So far as my knowledge extends, I don't know of any schools that, with service to the public good, could be abolished. It would place many children too far away from the schools.

17666. Besides the smallness of the attendance, is there any other impediment in the way of a young man rising?—There is an impediment with regard to the training establishment.

17667. What is that?—There is a rule of the Commissioners, that no man who has not graduated in the training schools in Marlborough-street, is eligible for first class.

17668. Mr. Stokes.—Is that rule maintained?—I have never known of a departure from it.

17669. Rev. Dr. Whelan.—Are you aware of that as a matter of fact?—I am aware of it. The teachers never go forward.

17670. Mr. Gibson.—Any classed teacher can rise?—He can.

17671. Is there any rule of the Board to prevent that classed teacher from rising up to the first place in the different grades?—Up to first the Inspector can

promote him. Then there is a rule of the Board that no untrained teacher is eligible for promotion to any division of first class.

17672. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You don't seem to be aware that rule is not in force now?—I thought it was in force. I have not known of any departure from it.

17673. Mr. Gibson.—You gave the answer on the supposition that the rule is still in force?—Yes.

17674. Sir Robert Kane.—Has any relaxation of that rule ever been communicated to you?—No.

17675. The Earl of Dunraven.—You stated just now that your income from school-fee was about £30 a year?—Yes.

17676. And that there are about 280 children on the rolls?—Yes.

17677. That makes nearly double the sum for each child that you stated as the average. Can you give any reason why, in your case, the school-fee are so much above the average?—Yes; mine is a respectable town school, and the fees are above the average.

17678. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is your school a mixed school of different denominations?—It could be so very easily said to be a mixed school with regard to the mixture of denominations.

17679. Are there children of respectable shopkeepers attending the school?—There are.

17680. Mr. Stokes.—What is the average attendance of children in your school?—Between 140 and 150.

17681. Does your school include girls?—No.

17682. The Earl of Dunraven.—What is the lowest school-fee?—One penny a week.

17683. What is the highest?—Ten shillings a quarter, for a few.

17684. Mr. Stokes.—Do these pupils who pay 10s. a quarter receive any additional advantages from the school beyond the ordinary children?—None whatever.

17685. Master Brooke.—In ascertaining the average paid to the teachers by the Board, did you include probationers?—Yes.

17686. Did you take in masters?—No, all the teachers paid by the Board, probationers, and assistants.

17687. On the other hand, the total sum to be divided was £192,000 which the Board pay to these persons?—Yes.

17688. What were these? How did you make out the sum total of school-fee?—The sum total of school-fee I took from the Board's report. It gives the sum total for each province, and a summary for all Ireland.

17689. Mr. Gibson.—Are you sure that does not include the money paid to masters?—The £51,000 is from local sources. The payment to masters is a distinct item which I did not touch at all.

17690. You are sure you did not include that?—I am quite sure.

17691. Mr. Sullivan.—Your average includes also gratuities?—Yes.

17692. Master Brooke.—You have mentioned the amount paid by the Board, and the amount paid by the pupils in school-fee. Was there any other sum included in your total?—No.

17693. Is there any other source of profit to the schoolmaster besides his salary and school-fee?—In the annual return which we send in to the Education Office, we include all sources of income. The value of a free house—payment in kind, that is all included under the head of parochial endowments, and all that amounts to only £52,000 a year.

17694. That goes to make up what you call school-fee?—Yes.

17695. That includes every source of profit?—Every source.

17696. One of your complaints is with regard to the want of a retiring salary. Would the schoolmasters, do you think, be content with a retiring salary being provided by a rebate from their salaries?—Not with the present rate of salaries. They could not afford the smallest rebate. I think if the salaries were raised to anything reasonable, that they would not object to that plan.

17697. Have the body you represent any complaint to make as to the mode of paying your salary?—Well, I have often heard it said the teachers considered it would be better if they were paid monthly. We are paid quarterly at present by the Board of Education. I heard several teachers express their opinion that it would be an advantage if they were paid monthly.

17698. But it is not a grievance, the system of paying quarterly?—We don't consider it in that light.

17699. Do any teachers consider it a grievance to receive their salaries through the hands of the managers instead of directly from the Board?—I never heard any opinion expressed to that effect at all.

17700. Sir Robert Kane.—Have you never heard of cases of teachers being inconvenienced by delays occurring in the payment of their salaries, through neglect, or otherwise, on the part of managers?—Not in any part of the country, I never did.

17701. Master Brooke.—Are there any complaints with regard to the absolute power of dismissal possessed by the managers, and the want of any right of appeal by the teachers to the Board?—That is a matter on which I was not instructed to offer any suggestion to you at all. The teachers I have consulted, and have spoken to about the matter, consider that a matter of very minor importance.

17702. You are quite willing it should remain as it is?—I did not hear any opinion, worth noticing, to the contrary.

17703. What is your own view on that matter? Are you quite satisfied there should be that absolute power of dismissal on the part of managers without appeal?—In the absence of any knowledge, on my part, of any hardship, or abuse of that power, I don't see, where it is not a grievance that comes under our notice frequently—that the present state of things should be disturbed.

17704. Mr. Gibson.—You have said you desire that the status of the teacher should be improved?—Yes, in a money point of view.

17705. Which, in your opinion, would an increase of salary, or providing a residence for the teacher attached to his school-house, be the more desirable mode of improving his status?—We don't consider the providing a residence would be anything at all commensurate with our wants at present. It is rural districts, where it is difficult to obtain a proper residence, the providing a residence would be a great benefit to the teacher, but it would not come up to our expectations. That would be only a matter of a few pounds a year.

17706. What is the amount would come up to your expectations?—As to the value of the residence, it would depend upon the locality, some teachers have, in some districts, to pay £4 or £5 or £6 a year for a very inferior residence.

17707. Suppose a house, built at the public expense, or at the expense of the patron, and that there were attached to the house an acre or two of land, viz. the master would have for his own use and benefit, would that effect such an improvement of their status as would remedy, to any extent, the inferiority they complain of?—There can be no doubt that everything done in that way would help them.

17708. State what would satisfy the teachers?—The general opinion expressed by them is, that their labours ought to be worth as much as the labour of a good carpenter, or bricklayer, to the State.

17709. Should they all get the same payment?—By no means. They expect that the income of even the lowest teacher—once he is cladded, has proved himself qualified, and is conducting his school satisfactorily—the teachers consider that other from the State alone, or from the State and local resources combined, such a teacher ought to have £30 a year.

17710. We are speaking of the payment from the State. You say all the teachers ought not to receive the same rate of payment. Give a graduated scale?—I am not prepared to suggest a scale. I say the teacher should first be placed above want, and that then a

No. 24, 1886.

Mr. Daniel Hanrahan

Nov 26, 1896.  
Mr. Daniel  
MacDonogh

attendant should be supplied to deserving men in the way of something additional. We are not extravagant in our demands.

17711. Supposing the present classification to be maintained, and taking the teacher in the third class of second division, who last year received £17, he should, you say, be raised to £50 a year?—From all sources, I consider he should.

17712. What I want to know is how much do you think he should receive from the State?—I don't think anything less than what I state would satisfy the teachers. A teacher cannot support himself in anything like common decency with anything less, considering the price of provisions and everything of that kind.

17713. Starting from that sum as the lowest, what would be the highest salary, according to your principle of gradation?—I state nothing particular as to that. I would hold out the inducement of something higher to deserving teachers; we ask that the lowest man in the service should have a competency. After that we leave it to the discretion of those who have the education of the country in their hands to hold out a stimulus to deserving teachers in the way of higher salaries. I am not prepared to suggest any other steps.

17714. Sir, Robert Kane?—In proposing a minimum salary of £1 a week for teachers, do you propose to include probationers?—No, only classed teachers. A teacher is not recognised till he shows his fitness.

17715. For the lowest class of classed teachers you propose a minimum salary of £50 a year?—Yes.

17716. How much of that £50 do you estimate might be fairly expected to be raised by school fees?—It would be very hard to answer that, the school fees are so variable in amount in different quarters, unless it was compulsory.

17717. Should you say £5 a year?—I should say somewhere to £8 or £10 a year might be kindly provided.

17718. If the suggestions made by a Commissioner were carried out of giving a house and one or two acres of land to each teacher, what would you estimate to be the value of these?—It would vary according to locality. Where I commenced school teaching, in the centre of the grading district of Meath, you would not get an acre of ground for less than a pretty round sum.

17719. Would it be too high to estimate the house and ground at £10 a year?—I think not.

17720. That would account for £20 out of £50, that is £10 for school-fee, and £10 for house and ground?—Yes.

17721. That would leave £30 as the amount of the net salary to be paid by the State?—Yes.

17722. What does the teacher to whom you propose to give a maximum salary of £50—what does he receive now from the State?—The lowest salary of a classed teacher is £18.

17723. Then the increment to be made by the State to his present payment in order to bring him up to your maximum salary would be £12 a year?—£12 from the Government.

17724. How many teachers would receive that maximum salary?—There are two divisions of third class. The salaries range from £18 to £34; between these two divisions, there are 2,295 third class teachers.

17725. How many in the third class in the lowest division?—A good many more than half. There are 1,300 of them in the lowest division.

17726. A total sum of about £15,000 would bring the salaries of the lowest class teachers up to the standard, which was represented as being satisfactory to the teachers?—I should think so.

17727. Mr. O'Shea?—Admitting the principle of classification, what would you fix upon as a fair remuneration for the second class—you said £50 was your minimum for the third class?—There might be with benefit a revision of the present system of classification with so many divisions. I have heard it and sometimes that there are too many steps in the scale.

17728. Take the first class teachers?—I think for a man of proved ability, and able for the programme for the first class published by the Board, £80 would not be an extravagant salary for him.

17729. What would you say for second class?—Strike a mean between these.

17730. Your highest is £80?—Yes.

17731. Do you admit a principle of increase of salary in proportion to the duration of time the teacher has been in the service?—I think that is a very fair rule, and calculated to do a great deal of good; and for a teacher who served a number of years faithfully that £80 might be increased.

17732. Commencing at the minimum they would increase gradually until they reached the maximum?—do you think that system would be satisfactory to the teachers generally?—I think it would.

17733. Are the female teachers of the National Board underpaid or overpaid?—Taking them as a class, their salaries do more for them than the salaries of the male teachers do for them. Their salaries are less in amount, but they have not the same responsibility as men.

17734. The gender number of the female teachers are unmarried?—Yes. They are able to live a good deal better on their present scale of salaries than the men are on theirs. I am far from saying it is what it ought to be, but it does a good deal for them.

17735. Have they good service allowances?—They have; but a very small number of teachers have it.

17736. You think that should be increased?—By all means. We consider that if it could be done, every teacher against whom no complaint is made, and who is discharging his duties faithfully, should receive the "Good Service" pay. Now it is restricted to a certain number. The Inspector might be willing to give it to a man, considering him well worthy of it, but by the rules of the Board he is tied down.

17737. What are the rules of the Board which restrict the actions of the Inspectors?—The number to receive that allowance is limited.

17738. The Earl of Desborough?—What proportion of the whole number of teachers receive this good service allowance?—I think there are about 500 or 600 receiving it.

17739. Is that grounded upon the report of the Inspector?—Yes, sanctioned by the Head Inspector. It runs past the two. That arrangement only lasts for one year. The teacher getting it this year is out at all sires of it next year. It requires a fresh report from each Inspector, and other formalities must be gone through every year for it.

17740. Mr. O'Shea?—Are you aware that some teachers have extra allowances for teaching extra branches?—I am.

17741. Supposing a teacher to avail himself of the opportunities afforded by the training school and to learn drawing and singing, so as to be able to teach them—he derives, of course, a corresponding advantage?—Yes; he may earn £2 or £3 or £5 a year by that.

17742. Is there not an allowance to those who teach paid mantras?—There is.

17743. That applies only to large schools?—Yes, in my school the Board would pay for three or four, or five mantras, but I cannot get them. They won't stay with me. For the last two years I did not receive £4 on an average under that head. If the system were working satisfactorily, and that the mantras would remain with me it ought to be worth £1 or £3 or £10.

17744. Do any large number of parents who could pay for their children refuse to pay?—I think there are a good many who could pay more than they pay at present, and could pay the penny a week more punctually than they do. There is a rule of the Board requiring a certain number to be in attendance in order to receive a certain salary. Now, it is a matter of great importance to the teacher to keep up the Board's salary, and if he enforces payment of school-fee that will bring down his average attendance. Two or three would be an important number on his average. This often causes him to refrain from enforcing payment of school-fee.

17745. The average attendance required being thirty-five for a first class teacher holds out as an inducement to

him to receive a greater number of pauper pupils.—Yes, and diminishes his school-fee. That limitation of thirty-five decreases gradually to all the classes.

17745. Could not the teachers by more activity on their part procure a larger average attendance of children, and a larger amount of school-fee?—I am not prepared to say. There might be something done in that way, but it could not materially affect in any way the total amount of school-fee.

17747. Master Brooke.—You mentioned that your school was nearly, or altogether denominational?—Yes.

17748. What denomination?—Roman Catholic.

17749. Your Inspectors are sometimes Roman Catholic and sometimes Protestant?—They are.

17750. Do you find any difficulty or inconvenience in the visits of Protestant Inspectors?—I never did.

17751. You see no inconvenience in having a Protestant Inspector visiting a Roman Catholic school?—I should think not. Under the present system of rules adopted by the Board, I don't see any.

17752. Does it occur to you there is any difficulty or danger arising from it?—Not that I can see.

17753. You have never practically found any difficulty?—Practically we not as if the school were mixed, when I observe the rules. No question, in my experience, ever arose with regard to the Inspectors.

17754. Does it occur to you that any rule or plan could be adopted to meet the difficulty that Mr. Gibson was suggesting about the payment of fees, in drawing the line between the children whose education ought to be gratuitous, and those who ought to pay?—If the managers took the matter into hands—which would be very troublesome—and attended to it, it would take a great deal of his time to see who should be admitted free, and who should not. From my long residence in the town of Nassau, and my knowledge of the people, I know at once who ought to pay, and who ought not.

17755. It rests practically with yourself?—It does, certainly. If I want to test them when they want to be admitted free, I tell them they should go to the manager. Sometimes I find that effective in drawing out the penny a week. I sometimes test them in that way.

17756. In fact there is no rule on the subject?—The rule I have always acted upon, and that is understood, is that whatever child is to be free, should be recommended by the manager.

17757. Is it the rule of the Board, or your own arrangement?—I don't think there is a rule of the Board on the subject.

17758. Mr. Gibson.—Is the tendency of school-fee to increase or decrease? I know that in some parts of Ireland there is rather a tendency to decrease. Is that the case in your experience?—It is not my experience in my school.

17759. In towns, where people live near to one another, and where they are engaged in business, there is a great anxiety to keep up a decent appearance?—The lower class of people, near towns, have more constant employment in the towns.

17760. Rev. Dr. Gibson.—You have spoken of the teachers as if they were not satisfied with their position?—I have.

17761. Does that apply to a large class?—I might say the whole.

17762. But with regard to yourself, are you pretty much satisfied with your own position, and your own salary?—With the exception of the retiring allowance, mine is an exceptional case.

17763. So that in other respects you are to regard you as more a representative man of others?—Exactly so.

17764. It is then very much for the sakes of the teachers who are not so well remunerated, you appear here to day in that representative capacity?—It is.

17765. In making up the total of your salary you referred to a small sum which you received for the monitors whom you teach?—Yes. Some years ago I received a good deal more. Of late years I scarcely receive anything. A monitor must sit in attendance for a year. In six months after he goes to an exami-

tion. If he acquits himself respectably according to the programme, I am awarded a gratuity of £1 or 50s. Of late years I can scarcely retain a monitor to go to this examination. They go away to other pursuits.

17766. Can you assign any reason, or reasons, for monitors going away?—They generally take it to prepare themselves for situations—for junior clerkships, or anything that way. They by no means take it to follow the profession of teacher.

17767. The ancillary system was proposed to fulfil an object of the Board—the supplying a teaching staff?—I am of that opinion decidedly.

17768. You stated that in your school, at Nassau, there is a considerable number of children of respectable parents—of persons of respectable position in society?—Yes.

17769. Are there any children of professional men?—Yes, I have the children of an apothecary.

17770. What does he pay you?—For his younger children, 5s. a week up to 10s. for the senior.

17771. Now, the complaint of the teachers is that they don't receive sufficient remuneration?—Yes.

17772. Do you attribute the unsatisfactory state of education in the country, generally, very much to that fact?—I do.

17773. May I ask what local efforts, generally speaking, are made in order to secure payment of school-fee to the teachers?—That generally lies with the teacher himself. I am not aware of any local effort being made.

17774. Do the managers, as a class, not make any individual personal effort to secure better remuneration to teachers from school-fee?—I think they are generally favourable to the teacher regarding as much as he can. I never knew one instance to the contrary; but my opinion is, that no matter what effort was made, the increase of school-fee would be scarcely perceptible.

17775. Do they make any practical effort to increase the school-fee?—I am not prepared with examples.

17776. As a class?—As a class, no.

17777. Do the gentry of the country?—Nothing at all.

17778. Are you aware whether the Commissioners of Education have ever attempted to get the managers as such, or the local gentry, to take an interest in the education of the country, with the view of supplementing the school-fee?—I am not.

17779. Now, with regard to this increase, which you consider so desirable in the amount of teachers' salaries, from what source do you expect that increase to come?—I should think it would not be unreasonable to have a local rate, seeing that there are local rates for various purposes—county rates, and things of that kind. To me, and to many others, it does not appear at all unreasonable that there should be a local rate, especially where landlords are not resident, and the children of their tenantry are very poor.

17780. Do you regard the State as, on the whole, paying a fair sum towards the support of the teacher?—That is a question I could hardly engage with.

17781. As representing the teachers, do you think it is their opinion the localities should pay more than they do?—Certainly not in the way of fixed school-fee from the parents, but in the way of local rate I think the localities should.

17782. If such a local rate were raised, should you exempt the parents of children well able to pay for the education of their children from any direct payment?—Certainly not; I should not exempt those able to pay.

17783. Do you think the local rate should be simply to pay for the education of the really poor?—It might be difficult to arrange it in that manner—so be able to say who was or was not able to pay.

17784. It would not be an easy matter to draw the line?—I think so.

17785. You say managers generally make an effort to get first class teachers. Are you aware of that as a

Nov. 24, 1898.

Mr. Duvel  
Manchester.

No. 24, 1868.

Mr. Daniel Macdonogh.

fect?—No; but they generally endeavour to obtain the best man, not looking to class particularly. A man's class is a recommendation in his favour. They look to his general character for success as a teacher.

17786. Generally do managers prefer first class teachers?—I would not say that.

17787. Are you aware that many say they prefer first of third class to first class teachers?—I never heard that.

17788. Should you be surprised if that was stated in evidence here?—I should.

17789. Could you assign any reason for the preferring first of third to first class teachers?—I could not imagine why any person having a knowledge of education should make such a statement.

17790. Now, with regard to pension—from what source should you expect pensions to be paid to teachers after lengthened service?—It is difficult for a man in any position to be able to answer that question. Naturally I would say from the source or sources from which they were paid while teaching.

17791. Do you think it would be a fair demand for a man to make that the State should give a pension in whole or in part, to superannuate a teacher?—I think it is an act of simple justice.

17792. On what ground?—On the ground that the salaries we received hitherto were too small to enable us to make any provision for old age. I live on the high road from the south and north-west of Ireland to Dublin, and there is scarcely a week of the year, so on average, in which an application is not made to me by old men who have spent their youth and strength in the service. They are very often coming to Dublin, their health broken down, in the hope of getting into some hospital in Dublin, in which they might recover themselves. I often see them going home again after trying the hospitals, and I have to give them succour on a shilling. I never gave it to any man I was not perfectly satisfied was a teacher. I examined his papers; I saw his teaching ticket and certificate of class and salary. Some of them, when they left the service of the Board, got a year or two year's salary, but of course it lasted only a short time.

17793. You say there are many cases in which the Commissioners don't give this retiring allowance to the teachers?—I did not say that, but I believe there is no positive rule on the subject.

17794. Are you aware whether there are many deserving teachers who don't receive such a retiring allowance?—I don't know cases of that kind, but we all know we cannot skin it.

17795. Do you think the schools are to any appreciable extent inefficient, owing to the fact of aged teachers holding on too long as teachers?—I do certainly.

17796. To what do you attribute that?—The natural repugnance of a man to relinquish his salary. As I said in the few words I read, both the Inspectors and managers are placed in a very difficult position. Humanity will cause them to be very slow in asking that man to resign.

17797. You think there are many teachers who are mentally and physically exhausted, but who still hold on?—I do. It is a very exhausting profession. Although not more than 24 years in the profession I feel it telling considerably upon me.

17798. You regard the teacher in each district as a most useful public servant?—I do.

17799. Do you know any other public servants in country districts who receive pensions or retiring allowances?—I know the Constabulary do.

17800. Are you aware that many of them retire on a pension of £60 per annum?—I do.

17801. You have met several such cases?—I have—hired constables; and often an idea of seignior ceased my mind that I did not, in my early career, enter the Constabulary, instead of becoming a schoolmaster. If I were to begin again I should enter the Constabulary.

17802. Do you regard the teachers as doing as important a work as the Constabulary in Ireland?—I

think it is more important. I think intellectual exertion should be placed before physical exertion.

17803. Do the soldiers of our country receive pensions after lengthened service?—They do.

17804. You regard National school teachers as equally entitled to annual pensions?—Yes.

17805. Rev. Mr. Cleave—Have you considered the question of payment by results?—Well, it has been a good deal talked of amongst the teachers.

17806. Do you see any objection to applying such a system in Ireland?—If applied, as I understand it is in England I think it would have the effect of closing up five-sixths of the National schools of Ireland.

17807. What do you understand to be the way in which it is applied in England?—The way in which I understand it is applied in England is that the Inspector comes once a year to examine the school. A certain number of children are presented to him by the master or patron of the school. He examines and passes a certain number in two or three divisions, and a certain allowance is made by the State for every child that passes.

17808. Are you aware that in England the manager is bound to provide at least half the expenses of the school?—I know of that rule was imposed upon Ireland, it would be found impracticable, from the poverty of the country, to carry it out.

17809. Suppose that half were provided in some way or other—either out of local rates, or by a payment from Marlboroughstreet, in the way of salary—do you not think it would be very good that the other half should depend upon the exertions of the teacher?—There is a great diversity of opinion with regard to whether payment by results is a good system or not. In my opinion we are actually at present paid by results.

17810. How do you make that out?—The class salary of the teachers is always dependent upon the number of children proficient in certain subjects. If the Inspector does not report that there is a fair number of children well instructed, especially in two, or three, or four fundamental subjects, the teacher is liable to be displaced or fined under the present system.

17811. So far as that is acted upon at present, do you think it has a beneficial effect or not?—In the way I speak of it has a beneficial effect.

17812. Then your doubt about the value of the system of payment by results does not apply to the principle to the extent to which it is carried at present?—I consider it would not be at all advisable to adopt it in Ireland as it is in England.

17813. I want to know your reasons for that. You say the present system is payment by results, and you think it acts beneficially and well?—Certainly.

17814. You agree that the rule requiring that the teacher should not receive salary unless a certain number of children had been well educated by him, is a good one?—Certainly.

17815. Is not that a very uncertain thing now?—I think not.

17816. Do you mean that the Inspectors throughout Ireland apply exactly the same standard in all the schools?—My experience of Inspectors is that they do. Of course each Inspector will, on certain subjects, have his own way of examining, and his individual ideas will give a tone to the examination, but, in the main, all the Inspectors, in compiling their statistics, proceed upon the same principle. An Inspector in a school will give a sum to a certain number of boys, and will set down the number who have solved it and the number who don't solve it, and that is, in fact, results.

17817. So if the payment were graduated according to that it would be only carrying out what you say exists at present in principle?—Our principle is better. It would be better to pass generally than to give numerical reasons for passing such and such a school. I believe the Inspectors give numerical reasons at the present time.

17818. If the payment were according to the



Nov. 24, 1898  
Mr. Daniel  
MacDonagh

work done, would not that answer?—There are other considerations. The number of children passing in a certain subject would not be a test of the teacher's work; it might be impossible for the teacher, from peculiarities in the neighbourhood, or from the seasons of the year, to pass children enough to enable him to a fair grant from the State, and, through no fault of his, there might be a falling off in the grant. That would be a very serious matter; a great many schools in Ireland are very small.

17819. Suppose the teacher were guaranteed a certain minimum income, would not that meet the difficulty?—I think if the system of results were applied in the modified form throughout Ireland it might work.

17820. Just suppose two cases I will put to you. Suppose a school had eighty children to pass, of whom sixty might pass and earn for a head for the teacher on the English plan, having also a fixed salary of £35, making a total of £40. I am not putting this as an advisable case but as a possible case. Suppose, finally, that the teacher, without having any salary, presented the children for examination, and that each child who passed would bring him 15s., so that he received £45, which of these two principles of payment I put before you would, in your opinion, be most beneficial to the teachers to accept? Do not look at the matter in the light of his receiving more money in one case than in the other, but take the certainty of a smaller sum in one case, and the uncertainty of the sum in the other?—I am quite certain the teacher would prefer the plan in which the fixed salary was included.

17821. Would you prefer it yourself?—Oh, no; so far as my school would be concerned I dare say I would be a gainer by the system of payment exclusively by results, but I am only representing the opinions of the teachers to whom I have spoken on the matter. My school is a large one, and an exceptional school, one of a number of schools that ought to be held out as prizes to deserving teachers.

17822. Now, with respect to the extent of pensions, supposing the salaries of masters were increased up to, we will say, as you have proposed, to £50 a year, do you think that in that case the teachers ought to look for any pensions from the State, or would they be able to make some provision for themselves?—As I said before they would be quite willing to adopt any plan that was in existence in similar cases.

17823. Suppose a teacher had attained the age of sixty years after forty years' service, what pension do you think he ought to get?—I would measure his pension by his standing in the service, and by his classification. Referring again to the Constabulary, a head constable receives a larger superannuation than a sub-constable.

17824. Take a teacher of, we will say, the second class, what do you think would be a fair sum?—I would say between £40 and £50 a year.

17825. Mr. Deane.—His previous salary having been how much?—Perhaps upwards of £60 a year.

17826. Rev. Mr. Coote.—Suppose a teacher were superannuated at fifty years of age after thirty years' service, would you give him the same?—No, I think length of service should be an element when considering retiring allowances. I think there should be a scheme devised by which teachers when they find their health failing might claim retiring allowances upon certification from properly qualified medical men that they were unable longer to discharge their duties properly, that they would be entitled to claim a retiring allowance, according to a graduated scale grounded upon both salary and service, even though they were only twenty years in the service.

17827. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you know what proportion the retiring allowances in the Civil Service generally bear to the salaries?—I believe about two-thirds.

17828. For what length of service?—I could not say, indeed.

17829. Rev. Mr. Coote.—The maximum cannot exceed two-thirds?—I believe so.

17830. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you know, as a matter

of fact, whether any first or second class teachers have insured their lives for the benefit of their families?—I never knew a case of it. Their salaries are generally so fluctuating, and their tenure of office also sometimes so unsatisfactory, that it is a serious thing with them to commence paying premiums on insurances which, after being paid for ten years, might lapse in consequence of the teacher not being able to continue paying the premiums.

17831. Mr. Stokes.—If we take it as proved that the position of the National school teachers of Ireland should be improved, do you not think the most judicious and most discriminating mode of improving their position would be an offer on the part of the State, in addition to the fixed salary which the teachers now receive, of a small payment on results, according to the number of children the teachers offer for examination and pass without failure in subjects of primary instruction?—I think the teachers would have no objection to it, first according to their fixed salary.

17832. What is the average salary of a National teacher of Ireland?—About £35 a year.

17833. I think you said that in estimating the average you included the female teachers as well as the male teachers, and you compared the teachers in respect of stipend with common day labourers?—Yes.

17834. Do you say that common day labourers in Ireland earn two shillings a day all the year through?—The teacher has an advantage in that respect, but I know day labourers in constant employment receiving two shillings a day.

17835. The Earl of Desseaux.—All the year round?—Yes.

17836. Day labourers?—Yes.

17837. Mr. Deane.—Would you put that before the Commission as the average pay of the day labourers in Ireland?—I would not.

17838. Mr. Stokes.—What do you mean by the phrase you used—a common day labourer—to what class of day labourer do you refer?—I include both those in constant employment and those hired by the day now and then, and who earn, of course, more.

17839. The Earl of Desseaux.—Do you know any case of an agricultural labourer who receives two shillings a day all the year round?—Not perhaps in money, but in the way of a house and some other little payments from his landlord I think it comes up to two shillings a day.

17840. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are the day labourers to whom you refer men employed as artificers or in agricultural work about a town?—At agricultural work about a town, not residing on the lands of the employers. If farmers go into a town to look for labourers they cannot get them at less than two shillings a day.

17841. Mr. Stokes.—What class of female labour do you compare with a common day labourer?—I could not say.

17842. Would you say that females in Ireland on an average earn two shillings a day?—Females are not employed that way in Ireland.

17843. Can you say what are the wages of common domestic servants in Ireland?—Well, I suppose about £5 a year, with board and lodging in the house.

17844. Is there any position bringing in £100 a year open to any day labourer male or female?—No, I think not.

17845. Can you tell the Commissioners what the average salary of the Church Education teachers is?—I know nothing at all about it.

17846. Have you heard that it is only about half the salary earned by the National Board teachers?—I never did. I am sure it is not because the Church Education teachers are provided with residences. If they were worth only half what the National school teachers get, they would not have a school at all.

17847. You stated that the small attendance at some schools prevented the receipt of the full salary, otherwise payable to the teacher?—Yes.

17848. Do you not think that small schools of that kind had better be taught by schoolmistresses?—I

Nov 30, 1905.  
Mr. Daniel  
MacDonagh.

should think that that would be a question for Inspectors more than for me. I am not able to give an opinion as to how mistresses discharge their duties in schools.

17849. Do you not think a first-class master thrown away in a small school with an average attendance of less than thirty?—I don't think he is. I think that thirty children well taught are a gain to the State.

17850. Were you a master?—The monarchical system was not in existence when I was a pupil.

17851. In what year did you begin to teach?—1844

17852. Were you trained?—I was.

17853. Does a lay labourer of any class enjoy any advantage corresponding to training from the State?—None that I am aware of.

17854. Is it part of your case that the Board have not kept faith with you, looking to the conditions of your first appointment?—I never said anything to that effect. Except for the introduction of the rule reducing a teacher's salary for smallness of attendance, I believe they have done their duty very fairly towards us.

17855. You have no complaint to make about that?—No, our complaint is, that, between all parties, we are not receiving what we consider a fair remuneration for our services. We are not going to saddle anyone with the blame, but we consider the State ought to take some notice of it, and give us a fair remuneration for services which we consider important.

17856. Do you remember that at the time of your appointment the National Board used annually to state they were not authorized to give salaries to teachers except in augmentation of local contributions?—I do.

17857. Is it not the local contribution that has failed, while the Board has been from time to time increasing their grants?—The local contributions have not gone down so much as to say they have failed. I don't think they have very considerably gone down; that school fees have gone down in total amount is known, but that they have gone down to the extent you seem to imply is not the fact.

17858. What ratio does the payment from the locality bear, on an average, to the payment from the National Board?—It is close on four times as much from the State as from local contributions.

17859. Assuming that the teacher ought to receive more, do you not think that the increase should rather come from the locality than from the National Board?—It is my opinion a large increase ought to come from the locality.

17860. Mr. Deane.—Was it not originally anticipated, when the National system of education was established, that the school fees would be larger in amount than they have proved to be?—I believe it was so anticipated.

17861. And the increase of salaries referred to by another Commissioner, as granted by the National Board, has, probably, been to make up for the deficiency in the school fees, which proved to be less in amount than was originally anticipated?—It is my opinion that the Commissioners, finding that the local rates were so inadequate, and, upon our representations, frequently increase the salaries.

17862. On another point—whose servants do you consider the National teachers of Ireland are?—We have been often told we are the servants of the managers.

17863. Does not that present to your mind a difficulty with regard to the payment of retiring pensions?—Well, I think it is not an insuperable difficulty.

17864. Rev. Dr. Wiffen.—Do you regard yourselves as the servants of the managers?—We have been frequently told by the Board that we are employed by the managers.

17865. I ask you, as representing the teachers, what is the opinion of the teachers?—Practically, we must regard ourselves as the servants of the managers.

17866. Mr. Deane.—Practically, do you say?—Yes, but not entirely, because the Board exercises a certain voice in our appointment and in our classification, and they will undertake to dismiss us from schools, so that we cannot exactly say the managers have all the power.

17867. But the Board would not dismiss a teacher except upon fault found and proved? A manager may dismiss a teacher without assigning any reason—is not that so?—I believe it is so.

17868. It was in reference to that fact that I asked you the question whether the fact of your being the servants of the managers and not of the State, presented itself to your mind as a difficulty with regard to retiring pensions from the State?—If it is a difficulty, it is a great hardship to us.

17869. Has it ever presented itself to your mind as a difficulty on the subject?—I heard it mentioned as a difficulty, but I think it is a difficulty that might be easily got over.

17870. We will suppose that twenty years' service would entitle you, under a new rule, to your retiring allowance. You might have served nineteen years; the manager would still have the power of dismissing you, we will say, from the school where you had been for nineteen years; if you did not get the position of a teacher in another school, you would then be deprived of your title to receive a retiring pension, as a person who had served less than twenty years?—Practically that is the case, but such a case is not likely to arise. I never knew a teacher removed from a school, except for gross misconduct, who found much difficulty in obtaining another school.

17871. You don't think that would be a practical difficulty?—I do not.

17872. You are representing the opinions of other teachers before the Commissioners to-day?—I am.

17873. Did I rightly gather from your answer to a question you were asked by another Commissioner that you were not authorized to make any statement of the opinion of the teachers, respecting their position with regard to managers—about their being subject to a suspicious exercise of power on the part of managers?—I am not authorized to make any statement at all to that effect.

17874. Was that question discussed at all at the meeting of the teachers by whom you were deputed to attend here to give evidence?—I heard it mentioned that the great majority of the teachers were entirely for having nothing at all to do with that question—that they do not consider it, by any means, a serious matter.

17875. Mr. Sullivan.—Did they do so as a matter of principle?—It was not.

17876. Or was their opinion founded on a belief that it was not a positive grievance?—It was not considered at all a matter demanding our attention.

17877. Mr. Deane.—With regard to the question of increased salary, or the advantage of a house—supposing you were offered a house and two acres of ground, I understood from you that you valued that, taking the average for Ireland, at about £10 a year?—I suppose it would be worth that.

17878. Supposing the offer were made of a house and ground, on the one hand, or of £10 a year in cash, on the other, which do you think would be more acceptable to the general body of teachers?—I think the £10 in cash would. My own opinion I think be rather in favour of a proper residence and a piece of ground.

17879. Which do you think would be more likely to improve the status of the school-teacher, and, in fact, to make him a more valuable servant to the State—an offer of £10 in money or of a house and place of ground worth £10 a year?—I would say the house and ground would be better calculated to improve his condition and raise his status.

17880. You stated that the gentry, as a general rule, are not contributors to education?—They are not.

17881. Do you consider that arises from indifference on their part, to the subject of education?—I should think so, and, from the fact of a great many of the Irish gentry being absent and not knowing anything about the matter, they are indifferent.

17882. Referring to those who are resident, would you say they are indifferent on the subject of education?—As a general rule, I do not see them taking

any interest in the National schools in their neighbourhood.

17883. Lord Glenbrook.—Are you not aware that, in many cases, they are not allowed to take an interest in them?—I am not.

17884. Are you not aware that the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities do not wish them to take an interest in them, and do not allow them to become patrons of schools, and desire that they should have nothing to do with education?—I am aware of the contrary. I was teaching in a school in which the Roman Catholic managers succeeded in obtaining the support and aid of several of the Protestant landed proprietors in the neighbourhood; he used to obtain £5 or £5 a year in aid of the teacher's salary from several of them.

17885. Rev. Mr. Cosse.—Is the manager of your school a Roman Catholic clergyman?—He is.

17886. Lord Glenbrook.—You are aware that there are great objections on the part of the Roman Catholic hierarchy against their being lay patrons of the schools?—I believe there is such a feeling, but it does not extend to an objection against their taking an interest in the school, perhaps in the way of giving annual donations.

17887. Exactly; they are willing to accept any money they can get, provided there is no possible interference?—The managers take the trouble of doing the work of the school, and, in my opinion, they would naturally expect those gentlemen would help to support the school.

17888. Mr. Stokes.—Do you not think, from your experience, that the work performed by the managers is one of very great value, so that the schools could not be worked without the performance of their functions?—I think we could not get on at all without the managers.

17889. Mr. Deane.—Does your idea of local aid point to a local rate, to be struck for educational purposes, like the poor-rate or the county rate?—Yes.

17890. What is your idea as to the class from whom that rate should be collected?—I would expect the landlord to pay the larger amount in proportion to the tenant farmer.

17891. On the ground that he derives more advantage from it?—Well, he does in the improved education of the people of the country, I think he has an interest in that. The farming class, in a great many localities in Ireland, are only living from hand to mouth, and the landlords ought, naturally, to be expected to give them assistance.

17892. Would you not suggest that it should be collected like the poor-rate?—There could be no objection to its being collected like the poor-rate, if landlords were to make an allowance in the rent.

17893. Of half?—I would say two-thirds; I would not exempt the occupier from the whole of it. It is only natural he should pay some portion of it, but the landlord, in the present circumstances of the country, should be expected to pay more than half.

17894. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you know of any civil servants of the State who are appointed by external authority, and who are dismissible by an external authority?—I do not, except clerks of unions, who are appointed by the Boards of Guardians.

17895. And dismissible by whom?—They are dismissible by the Poor Law Commissioners by means of sealed orders.

17896. But are they dismissible by the Boards of Guardians?—Yes.

17897. Without appeal?—I should think so. I am not certain, but I know the Commissioners have frequently dismissed workhouse officers by sealed orders.

17898. At present the manager may dismiss a teacher without any appeal, or without giving any reason for doing so?—I believe that is so.

17899. Do you believe it would be possible, under such circumstances, to carry out the principle of dismissing the teachers by the State?—I think it would.

17900. I think you stated that the Commissioners of Education have the power of dismissing teachers?—

Yes, I have often heard of their sending down letters to managers to dismiss such and such teachers.

17901. They have the power of fining?—They have.

17902. Do they often exercise that power?—Not frequently.

17903. Has that power been complained of as a grievance?—No.

17904. Was it contemplated in the first plan of National Education that the Board should have the power of summarily fining without reference to the managers?—The manner in which the Board acted is by stopping a certain portion of the salary. I suppose they always had that power.

17905. As a matter of fact, has not the power of the Commissioners in the system been increasing?—I could not say. I am not aware of any power they have assumed lately.

17906. As long as you have been in the Board's service, have they exercised that power of fining?—They have.

17907. You are not aware of whether or not in the original scheme that power was granted to them?—I am not.

17908. Do you know of any case of grievance arising from the levying of fines by the Commissioners?—I am not aware of any case.

17909. Do you know, of your own knowledge, of any case of a fine bearing no undue proportion to the amount of the teacher's salary?—Indeed I know very little about the fines. I sometimes hear of teachers being fined. It is not a very common occurrence. I am not acquainted with particular cases.

17910. Do you think it is a disadvantage in certain districts of the country, where the people are extremely poor, that the teachers should be obliged to live at considerable distances from their schools, and in uncomfortable houses?—That is a case of great hardship and inconvenience.

17911. You are in favour of the teacher living convenient to his school?—Yes; in walking to his school a mile or two in the morning, he might get a wetting that would endanger his life, and the deaths of teachers have been caused in that way.

17912. You think it would improve the condition of a teacher, and convenience him, to have a house of his own near to the school?—I think so.

17913. How far would that apply to female teachers?—Equally as to the males.

17914. What are the average proportions in your district of those who pay school-fees, and of those who do not pay?—I cannot answer that question.

17915. In other words, do the managers relieve many of the pupils attending the schools from payment?—As far as I am able to form an opinion on it, the teachers and managers do not find much difficulty in arranging that.

17916. Do they arrange that mutually, or is the power of dispensing with payment left entirely to the managers?—The manager is the final authority in such cases if there is a dispute with the teacher.

17917. In cases where a large number of pupils are dispensed from paying fees, does the manager make any allowance to the teacher in lieu of the fees he dispensed?—In some cases he does.

17918. Is that a general practice, or does it occur only rarely?—It is not a general practice.

17919. What do you estimate on an average the fees of all the teachers come to?—£8 per annum. That is including the value of residences where there are free residences at present existing, including also other local endowments or payments in kind.

17920. Upon what year have you based your calculations?—1866.

17921. Lord Glenbrook.—Is that an approximation on your part, or a calculation taken from returns?—I have taken it from the returns of the Commissioners for 1866.

17922. Mr. Sullivan.—There is a great disproportion in the different parts of the country in the amount of those fees?—Of course Ulster is the best, in some

Nov. 24, 1866.

Mr. Daniel  
Macdonough.

Nov 24, 1898.

Mr Daniel  
MacDonagh

question of the superior social condition of the people. Consequent is at the bottom of the scale.

17923. Lord Olsbrook.—Exclude Ulster, and take the average of the other three provinces?—The average would be considerably lower.

17924. Like two separate countries?—Yes. Averages are not always to be depended upon; still they tell to a certain extent.

17925. Mr. Sullivan.—That estimate also includes the large town schools—the model schools?—It does.

17926. So that in the rural schools, which form the greater number in the country, the average is very much below £8?—Yes.

17927. What is the average in some rural school in your neighbourhood?—£3 and £3; some not up to £2.

17928. Have any suggestions been made by the teachers themselves as to the mode of enforcing payment of fees?—They say it is impossible to enforce them.

17929. On what ground do they say so?—The people are, in fact, at present paying very nearly as much as they are able.

17930. Is there not a great number of farmers well able to pay such small sums?—I don't think there is. The better way to reach those who may be able and will not would be by a tax.

17931. That implies that in your belief they are able to pay?—There may be cases of it.

17932. If you levy a tax universally upon farmers, and expect them to pay part of it, does not that imply that you believe that if they don't pay fees, they ought and are able to pay?—There may be cases in which they might pay more.

17933. Lord Olsbrook.—Do you believe that any class, whose children receive instruction in National schools, pay as much school-fee as they should pay for the education of their children?—Where they are able to pay I believe that, as a general rule, they do pay.

17934. Some of the children of the upper classes pay up to a quarter?—Yes.

17935. Do you believe these people are paying as they ought to pay for the education of their children? Well, I think that is very fair remuneration.

17936. Mr. Sullivan.—Previous to the introduction of the National system, did not the mass class of people who send their children now to the National schools send them to pay schools?—They did not. The greater number of children now taught almost gratuitously in National schools never entered a school in former times at all.

17937. Is your part of the country are there any private advantage schools?—There is one day school in my town.

17938. What class attend that?—Twelve or fifteen little children go to it.

17939. Of what class is that?—Children of the smaller class of shopkeepers.

17940. They prefer sending their children there rather than to a public school?—They have an idea that the masters may be able to devote more time to them. Some of them are defective. I heard that assigned as a reason.

17941. Lord Olsbrook.—They don't get as good an education in that school as they would receive in yours?—That is my opinion.

17942. Mr. Gibson.—Would you be surprised to find that in some parts of Ireland where there are paying schools the National teachers cannot raise any fees at all from some class of children?—I would be surprised. There must be some peculiar circumstances in the place.

17943. Would you be surprised to find that it exists in several districts?—I would be surprised to find that it is anything like a general practice.

17944. How many vesting schools in the country, do you consider they are extremely few or numerous?—I believe they are extremely few.

17945. What would you call few?—If there were no more than one or two in each Inspector's district I would call it few. We have sixty districts.

17946. Within your own knowledge there are no

such schools?—Not as far as I am acquainted with my district. I think there are not more than two or three.

17947. There are two or three?—Even including a superior school for boys learning classics.

17948. You include such schools?—Then I don't know of any one at all, except the one in my town, for a peculiar class of children I speak of. I think there are fifteen children going to it.

17949. Is not the general impression amongst the people that the State ought to pay for education, and that they are not bound to contribute anything?—I meet some ignorant people who say, "Oh, we might not pay you anything, for you are paid by the Government;" but that is not by any means a general opinion. I did hear it expressed though.

17950. You don't think it is a general error?—I do not.

17951. Mr. Stokes.—You said you remembered the time when the National Board granted increased salaries to teachers—about the time at which you commenced teaching. Will you read a passage on the subject from the report for 1844 which I point out to you?—I will.

"We neither profess nor are we authorized by the State to make grants of salaries to teachers, except in aid of local contributions from the patrons of the schools and from the parents of the children."

17952. Do you think that the Board, which considerably and most properly departed from that principle during the famine times, might now in the improved state of the country revert to it with advantage?—I am not aware that I ever stated it was in consequence of the famine or anything of that kind they gave the present increased rates of salary.

17953. Are you aware when they departed from the rule set forth in the passage which you have read?—I am not aware that they ever acted upon it.

17954. Did they not act upon it in 1844, the year to which that report refers?—Certainly not. I never knew them to require a certain amount to be subscribed by the localities as a condition of their granting aid to the localities.

17955. In the year to which that report from which you have read refers, did they pay the whole salaries of the teachers?—They did not. There were school fees levied then exactly as they are now.

17956. Do you remember what salaries they did pay them to the teachers?—Was not £8 the minimum and £15 the maximum?—I believe you are right; £8 was the lowest and £15 or £20 was the highest.

17957. In what years did Ireland suffer from the famine?—1845 and 1847.

17958. Do you not suppose that it was in consequence of the famine the Board waived that rule?—I do not think it was; I remember them sending round a pound or two to the teachers at that time as an aid.

17959. Supposing the claim for pensions to be allowed, do you not think the Board should have the power of placing the masters in any part of Ireland they pleased, so that they might serve in poor districts presenting no local advantages—do you not think the Board should be empowered to deal with the masters just as ordinary civil servants are dealt with in other branches of the public service?—That, I take it, would be trenching upon the power enjoyed by the managers at present, whom I consider it would be very injudicious to meddle with. The managers are the only gentlemen in Ireland at present who take an interest in education. It is a question I would not like to have anything to say to.

17960. As long as the master is free to leave the service of the Board at any time he likes, and while he remains in it, to place himself in the best position he can command—do you think that, by serving upon these terms, the master gains any claim upon the State, really and truly, for a retiring pension?—I think, on general grounds, a man who serves, say, fifteen or twenty years, and that his health has failed him in the service, it is only matter of simple justice to give him a retiring allowance.

Nov. 24, 1886.

Mr. David Macdonough.

17961. Is not his service voluntary during the whole period?—So it is with various other civil servants. They are not bound. A clerk in a Government department, I take it, can leave when he likes.

17962. Do you think a clerk in any public department chooses the place in Ireland where he can live—do you think he makes his own bargain with any employer he pleases to go to?—No; of course there is a difference in that.

17963. Is there any analogy at all between the position of the schoolmaster and the civil servant?—I think there is.

17964. In what features of the cases do you trace it?—The Board's officers examine him, find him, increase his salary, take him and train him, and expend the Government grant in preparing him for his business.

17965. Are these advantages or disadvantages to the master?—The preparing him the better to do his business is an advantage to the country in general.

17966. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Your school is a non-vested school I presume?—Yes.

17967. What religious instruction is given in the school?—The Roman Catholic catechism is taught for half an hour each day.

17968. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—On the 21st June, when the Constabulary courted, you had three Protestant children present?—Yes.

17969. Is that the ordinary proportion, 5 to 150?—It is above it; they are three brothers. The father had some disagreement with the Church Education Society's teacher and he sent them to me.

17970. What is the Church Education Society's school in Nass called?—It is called the "Nass Parish School."

17971. Are there two Church Education Schools—one for boys and one for girls?—There are.

17972. And besides your school, is there not a convent school?—There is, and that small school I speak of.

17973. Do you consider that any of the schools in Nass represent mixed education so far as religion goes?—I do not.

17974. Would you say that mixed education prevails to any extent in your neighbourhood?—I am not aware that it does.

17975. Mr. Sullivan.—Do the teachers look upon the power of summary dismissal by the managers as a grievance?—Certainly not.

17976. Lord Clonbrock.—You are not yourself of opinion there should be any alteration in that respect, you would leave the managers full control?—As I said before—in the absence of any arbitrary or capricious exercise of that power, I think it would be injudicious to interfere with the manager's power of appointment.

17977. That is the very question; do you think it desirable to leave the manager the full control?—I do.

17978. Mr. Sullivan.—Is that the opinion of the teachers?—Yes.

17979. You state that as the result of their consideration on the subject?—Yes.

17980. Rev. Mr. Currie.—I suppose it may be assumed that instances of abuse of power on the part of the managers are extremely rare?—Yes; I have not known any instances of it.

17981. It has been stated here that most of the teachers in Ireland have been so on an average about eight years in their situations; have you ever seen that stated?—I have not.

17982. You represent the teachers of Leinster only?—Yes.

17983. Mr. Sullivan.—As far as you know do the managers devote much attention to the working of the schools?—They do intend; in my part of the country they devote a fair amount of attention and supervision to the schools.

17984. Do you think it would be beneficial if they took a more active part in visiting?—My school is visited daily. Not a day of the week scarcely but I have the manager, or his representative, in the school.

17985. Lord Clonbrock.—Who is the manager?—The parish priest.

17986. Do you think the frequent visit of the managers would be beneficial to the schools?—I do.

17987. You say you think it would be an advantage to have a rate struck to assist in education?—I do.

17988. Respecting school sites—how are they obtained generally?—Practically speaking, I am not aware of any difficulty in obtaining a site.

17989. If a rate were struck for the maintenance of schools, would that, in your opinion, create any ground for change in the management of schools?—I don't know how that question might arise; but I am quite certain the present arrangement seems to me to be working very well, as far as the managers are concerned, and that it would be very injudicious to meddle with it.

17990. What is the present arrangement?—The manager has the appointment of the teacher.

17991. Anybody who applies to him?—He selects the most eligible of the applicants for the situation. They must, of course, be pronounced properly qualified by the Board's officers, before any salary is given. The manager's is the hand through which the salary comes to the teacher. He certifies as to the teacher's character, his general conduct, and attention to business. There should be some authority for the Board's paying salary.

17992. Mr. Sullivan.—Do many of the teachers in your district pay the rent and keep the school in repair?—A good many of them do.

17993. Has that matter formed the subject of discussion among the teachers?—No.

17994. Do they look upon it as a grievance?—They do; whenever it occurs they look upon it as a grievance, but it is not a general rule.

17995. Have you been asked to put it forward for consideration?—I have not.

17996. Mr. Stokes.—Who provides for the incidental expenses of your school, such as cleaning the room, pens, ink, fuel, and the like?—The pupils, by some little note or other, provide the pens, ink, and fuel. The manager, out of some fund at his disposal, keeps the place in repair.

17997. In conducting your large school, what assistance have you?—I have two assistant teachers, and three paid monitors, at present. The Board would pay more, but I cannot get them.

17998. Are the assistant teachers paid by the Board?—They are.

17999. Can you say what they receive?—The two I have at present receive only £15 each, being in the probationary class at present.

18000. What do the monitors receive?—Three junior monitors I have at present; the highest salary for a junior monitor is £4 per annum.

18001. Can you say what is the whole sum paid to your school by the Board in the year?—I find the total is £38, but I don't think the teacher will get that every year, in consequence of vacancies.

18002. Suppose an arrangement to be made, and that a grant of £50 was placed annually at your disposal, for working that school, do you think you could employ it to better advantage than it is made to yield at present by the Board?—I don't think I could; I would not like that responsibility to be thrown upon me.

18003. Could you use it so as to render education in Nass more efficient than at present?—I never considered that question.

18004. Lord Clonbrock.—Does the teacher exercise an influence upon the attendance at the school?—Of course the character of the teacher always influences the attendance, and brings children, perhaps, from a greater distance than they would come if he was not a teacher of great efficiency.

18005. A competent teacher has a considerable influence upon the attendance?—Not considerable. He sometimes brings a few additional scholars to a school.

18006. Would the influence of an efficient teacher

Nov. 25, 1905  
Mr. Daniel  
Macdonough.

be considerable under a system of payment by results in which attendance should be one of the elements!—That is one of our objections to paying by results that it would induce a rivalry in country districts such to be deprecated.

18007. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you know the Constabulary district of Nass?—I do not know how far it extends. There are county inspectors and sub-inspectors whose exact districts I am not acquainted with.

18008. By the Constabulary return giving the number of children actually present in primary schools on the 25th of June, I find that in the Constabulary district of Nass there were twenty-two schools, large and small, public and private, and out of the twenty-two I find seven schools with children of different denominations attending there—should you regard these as mixed schools?—Mine is one of them, and I would not exactly regard it as a mixed school.

18009. Should you regard these as mixed schools?—If the fact of there being children of different denominations in them makes them "mixed," of course they are.

18010. Do you know the number of children of different denominations attending the schools in that district?—I do not.

18011. I see by this return that there were ninety-two Established Church children—if seventy-seven of these were attending schools with children of other denominations should you regard these as mixed schools?—It would be a large proportion in them certainly.

18012. Then would you modify the opinion you gave awhile ago when you said you believed there was no mixed attendance in schools in the district?—It would change my opinion to a certain extent. If from the fact of there being three Protestant children in my own school you infer it is a mixed school, I cannot say anything more about the matter.

18013. Rev. Mr. Curtis.—Do you consider this a specimen of mixed education if you find a Church Education Society's school with seven or eight Protestant children and one Roman Catholic child?—That did occur with me once. A man and I had a difference, and he sent his child to the Church Education Society's school. But when the man's temper cooled the child came back.

18014. Is the general feeling in your neighbourhood for denominational education or mixed education?—I could only answer that by inference. I see Roman Catholic children come to schools under Roman Catholic management and teaching, and Protestant children go to schools under Protestant management and teaching.

18015. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you know Kilted National school?—I know the neighbourhood.

18016. Should you regard that as a mixed school having on a certain day three Established Church children and forty-seven Roman Catholic children in attendance?—On the same ground that I would not regard mine as a mixed school I would not regard that.

18017. Do you know Rathmore school?—Yes.

18018. Should you regard that school with four Established Church children and thirty-one Roman Catholic children in attendance as a mixed school?—I would regard that school as approaching nearer to a mixed school. These schools are in the same neighbourhood, and there is no Church Education school in the neighbourhood.

18019. Do you know Carnalway school?—I do not. I know where it is.

18020. How far from Nass?—Four or five miles.

18021. Should you regard that school with twenty-six Established Church children and five Roman Catholic children in attendance, as a mixed school?—I might say that this is a subject upon which, as a school master, I never considered I was competent to utter the subject of mixed education.

18022. Mr. Stokes.—Do you find from your experience that in every district, from mixed marriages, and from motives of caprice, such as you have alluded to there are some children who leave the school they are sent to and go to other schools?—Yes, a few, such as I have stated.

18023. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What is the amount of religious instruction given in your own school?—Half an hour each day as regards time.

18024. In what subjects?—The catechism of the diocese.

18025. Anything else?—Nothing else.

18026. Who gives that instruction?—I do, and the monitors and students under me.

18027. Any other parties?—The parochial clergyman.

18028. How often does he attend to give religious instruction?—He frequently comes in and superintends it, and sees that it is going on.

18029. Does he ever give religious instruction himself?—Yes.

18030. Does he once a month, as a rule?—No.

18031. Once a quarter as a rule?—He does.

18032. More frequently than once a quarter?—He does.

18033. How often in the twelve months?—Direct religious instruction at certain times, when preparing for certain religious matters that occur; three or four or five times a year, then there is special religious instruction. At ordinary times we conduct it under his superintendence.

18034. Mr. Stokes.—Do you ever send the children to chapel for religious instruction?—Yes.

18035. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Does the religious instruction ever interfere with secular instruction?—Never.

18036. Is it ever continued for a whole day at a time?—Never.

18037. Or half a day?—Never.

18038. Have you ever heard teachers say they were constrained to give religious instruction at certain seasons for half a day?—Not during school hours. When preparing for sacraments there is extra time required to prepare the children.

18039. So far as you know or have heard the rules of the Board are not interfered with?—They are not.

18040. Mr. Stokes.—Is it not the case that at the approach of confirmation you give a whole day for religious instruction. You regard that as a holiday?—I would not think of giving it in the school.

18041. Has it ever happened that for a day or five days, or a week, you gave nothing but religious instruction because of preparing for confirmation?—It never happened in my time.

18042. Mr. Sullivan.—In such cases is not religious instruction given in churches?—No teacher would think of violating the rule of the Board. It is very strictly carried out.

18043. In preparing the children for confirmation or first communion—when a day is occupied with religious instruction is it not in the church it is given?—The children go to the church.

18044. When you give religious instruction, do you not represent the patron for the time being, and act under his superintendence and authority?—Of course, when he is a clergyman.

18045. Therefore his not giving religious instruction more than once a month does not prove that the children do not receive religious instruction daily?—There is a constant, almost a daily superintendence, exercised even me to see that I give it.

18046. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You regard the teacher generally as qualified to give that religious instruction?—Certainly, so far as the catechism is concerned.

[Adjourned.]

FORTY-SEVENTH DAY.—DUBLIN, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1865.

PRESENT :

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, K.P.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACKAY.  
The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MORRIS.  
SIR ROBERT KANE, C.B.E.  
WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., K.C.  
Rev. DAVID WALTON, D.D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASSETT STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.P.  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C. } Secretaries  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq. }

The Rev. JOHN SCOTT PORTER sworn and examined.

Nov. 25, 1865.

The Rev.  
John Scott  
Porter.

18047. The Chairman.—What is the religious body to which you belong?—I belong to the Non-Subscribing Presbyterian body in Ireland, a body which is Presbyterian in point of discipline, but theologically and ecclesiastically distinct from what is called the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. In my own sentiments I think it right to add that I am a Unitarian.

18048. What is the congregation of which you are a minister?—It is called the First Presbyterian Congregation of Belfast.

18049. Do you hold any other official position in connexion with your religious body?—I am one of the theological professors appointed to superintend the theological part of the education of young men preparing for the ministry in the Non-Subscribing Presbyterian Church.

18050. What number of congregations does your body contain?—The Non-Subscribing Church in Ireland contains forty-two congregations altogether.

18051. Are all the schools belonging to your body in connexion with the National Board?—I think I may say all our schools that are intended for that class of the population for whom the National system is designed to provide are so connected. As far as I know, all; certainly all belonging to my own congregation, and these other congregations with which I am most familiar.

18052. Did your body join the National Board at the same time as the Synod of Ulster, or separately?—Separately, and before the Synod of Ulster joined. The Synod of Ulster generally did not get its schools into connexion with the National system until the viceregency of my Lord Ebrington. All that were then existing of ours were placed in connexion with the National system from the very first.

18053. Are any of your schools in connexion with chapels, or are they on separate sites?—Almost all of them are connected with the congregations in so far as that they were erected first and are still sustained by the congregations worshipping in the chapels, but I do not recollect any but one which is attached to a chapel, that is to say, locally attached to it, built upon the chapel ground, or indicating any special connexion with the church or chapel by its appearance or position.

18054. My question was directed merely to that latter point—that is to whether they were connected with or appendages to the chapels?—They are not generally appendages to the buildings or to the grounds in which the congregations assemble for worship.

18055. Can you state about what the number of children in your schools is at present?—I can only state the numbers of those that are in the schools of which I am myself local manager, of these schools there are nominally five, perhaps, however, it would be more correct to consider them as two institutions,—one having three branches—a boys' school, a girls' school, and an infants' school, and the other two branches—a girls' school and an infants' school. The average attendance in one of these establishments is more than 150, viz.—40 in the boys' school, 40 in the infants' school, and about 50 in the girls' school.

The other two schools are more numerous, averaging together upwards of 200 daily.

18056. Is there much admixture of religions in the schools, first, where you yourself exercise supervision, and, secondly, in the schools generally of your body?—A very considerable mixture of religions, with the exception of the Roman Catholic body. Of late the bishops and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church have so much discontinued and discouraged mixed education generally, and especially the going of children belonging to their Church to schools that are under the management of Protestants, or in which Protestant teachers are employed, that the numbers of Roman Catholics attending those schools of which I speak, are very few at present. Formerly they were more numerous. But of other denominations,—the Established Church of Ireland, and various Presbyterian, and Wesleyan, and other Methodist sects, we have a very large admixture. I may say, indeed, that of the pupils attending the schools under my management, of which I am now speaking, a very small proportion consists of the children of persons belonging to my own Church.

18057. Is your body generally favourable to the system so administered by the National Board?—I should distinguish, my lord, with regard to that question. We are favourable to the principle of united education, and so far as the system of the National Board is a system of united education we are extremely favourable to it, but we rather think that the National Board, or the system under its management, has been drifting into denominationalism, and so far as that is the case, I think that most both of the ministers and laity of the religious body to which I belong are opposed to it.

18058. Does your body maintain any training school for teachers of its own?—None.

18059. Have you had any experience of any model or training school under the Board?—I have paid particular attention to the model and training school in Belfast, and in my visits to the city of Dublin I have generally taken occasion to inspect the model schools in Marlborough-street, and the result of my observation in both places has been exceedingly favourable, so much so as to impress me with a very high sense of the value of these schools.

18060. Do you consider there is any difference in the efficiency of the teachers trained by the Belfast school as compared with those trained in Dublin?—I should say not; but of the teachers whom I have had under my management some were trained in the Belfast and other District Model Schools in the initiatory part of their curriculum. After they had been employed in teaching for some time several of them were drafted off to Dublin and trained in the training institution connected with the National Board in Dublin.

18061. Are the teachers in the schools maintained by your body chiefly of their own religious persuasion?—My lord, it is difficult for me to answer that question. I have no doubt that a manager of the Non-Subscribing Church or the Unitarian body would, *ante faciem*, prefer a teacher of his own denomination. He is not always able to get one, or he may be able to

Nov. 24, 1866.

The Rev.  
John Scott  
Porter.

procure others who seem more suitable; and in many cases schools are conducted, and most satisfactorily conducted, under non-subscribing ministers, by teachers of other Churches. I have some teachers in my own schools who are quite of a different way of thinking from myself; yet I am as well pleased with them, and they, I believe, are as well pleased with me, as if we were both of the same way of thinking.

18962. Are those teachers that you speak of Presbyterians or belonging to other bodies?—I do not think I have at present any teachers in the schools under my own superintendence who are not Presbyterians of one sort or other, or members of the Established Church, but I have had Methodists and I have had members of other Churches.

18963. Have you had any teachers who have not been trained?—Several.

18964. What is your opinion as to the comparative efficiency of trained or untrained teachers?—Beyond all comparison I should say trained teachers are the most efficient—so much so that I would never accept an untrained teacher now, with the experience I have had, if it were possible for me to obtain the services of one who had been trained.

18965. Do you find your teachers remain long in the service?—We have one lady—I may call her a lady, for she is a lady in mind, feelings, and manners, though born in an humble rank, who has been in a school connected with my congregation since the year 1832, and I think will remain with us as long as her life and capacity for labour remain.

18966. Have many of your teachers got better employment in commercial establishments in Belfast?—I have been subject to the removal of my male teachers from the male school in that way—the females not so much so. Usually the females leave to get married.

18967. Do you find a difficulty in filling up the places of teachers when vacancies occur?—Once or twice, but not lately, I have been obliged to accept what I considered inferior persons to those who were leaving.

18968. Do you teachers get more than the Government salary?—The head teachers do. The head teacher of the Stoney-street boys' school receives an additional salary of, I think, £12 a year, from the proprietors of the school, which belongs to a lady. The head female teacher receives, I think, £8; and the head teacher of the infants' school receives an additional salary of £6; and all this is in addition to the school fees paid by the children. In the Fountain-street schools the head mistresses have a free residence; and one of them receives a salary of £15 per annum from the school funds.

18969. What proportion of the children in your five schools do you suppose do not make any weekly payments?—The proportion must be quite infinitesimal. The sums demanded are very small. In the boys' and girls' schools in Stoney-street the payment is twopenny a week, with one penny for those who are learning what are called the extra branches—music and drawing. In the infants' school one penny a week. In the Fountain-street girls' school the payment is twopenny a week, and no charge for the extra branches; and in the infants' school, as before, one penny a week.

18970. Do you find that the possession of a home adds much to the comfort of a teacher?—Greatly, and one very important point is secured by it—namely, that we always know where to find the teacher. We have no occasion to hunt through the town, as we should have to do if she has changed her residence.

18971. Do you consider that the present salaries of teachers are sufficient?—No, my lord, I consider them very insufficient. The circumstance that I have mentioned—that so many young men, after they have served for a time as teachers, go off to other employments, as bookers' clerks, lawyers' clerks, and clerks in public offices, and clerks in mercantile offices—shows that the amount of remuneration is not sufficient to encourage persons of good attainments to remain in those employments.

18972. Is it not to a considerable extent desirable

that teachers, after a certain number of years' service, should be able to better themselves, and give place to younger men?—I dare say that when a man begins to be unequal to his work, it is well that we should get rid of him, and that a younger man should take his place. But, on the other hand, it is a great pity that just when a teacher has learned his business well, and is thoroughly up to it, not merely in the acquisition of knowledge, but the mode of imparting it, and of maintaining order and discipline in his school,—when he becomes, in fact, a good manager of a school,—that immediately he takes his departure, and leaves us to shift as best we can—sometimes on very short notice too.

18973. Do you think that the State should be called upon to give increased salaries to the teachers, or that that should come in some way from local sources?—It is difficult to answer that question absolutely. But, on the whole, I rather think it would be better to enlarge the salaries, and with that I would combine a system of rewards for distinguished proficiency. I am a good deal impressed with the importance of a regulation which, I understand, prevails in the schools under the Church Education Society—namely, that the Inspectors once a year hold a specific and detailed examination of each class in every school. Those of the pupils who have made a certain proficiency, according to a programme which is laid down, are moved into a higher class, and in proportion to the number of the pupils who are advanced to a higher class the teacher's remuneration is enlarged. That, I think, is a very good thing; and in order to encourage the pupils to do their best, so as to merit themselves creditably at those examinations, I should be disposed to give a considerable number of pecuniary prizes. I think that the pecuniary prize is, after all, the one that would be most effective for the purpose—that is, prizes for those who did best. I know that there is a great objection to the system of giving prizes, because it is said that the child is normally receiving education, but really is working with another thought in his mind, and that that is a bad kind of training. Well, there is danger of that undoubtedly; but I think at the same time that the effect of the prizes would be very good in stimulating regularity of attendance, and great exertion on the part of the pupils. Of course the teacher should continue to receive the children's school fees.

18974. Supposing an increase were made in the teachers' salaries, do you think it would be desirable that such increase should be made dependent upon what is called in England results?—Yes, that is exactly the idea that I was expressing—results; provided always that the results should not be confined, as I understand is the case in England, to two or three branches, which are called the paying branches, to the expense of others. I think that the results should comprehend the whole of the teaching that is given in the school.

18975. You think that it would be desirable that the result should be taken on a considerable number of subjects?—On a considerable number of subjects.

18976. Do you consider the inspection as now conducted by the Government Inspectors is of a sufficiently close and effective character?—I have found it to be of great value in all the schools with which I am connected myself and of which I have any knowledge. I look upon it as one of the best parts of the system; and I may explain to your lordship, how, in one respect. Many managers are not themselves very good judges of the requirements of the school, and sometimes give a manager is, from his having had experience in teaching (which I may say is my case, for I was a teacher for many a year), it is sometimes very hard for him to get the local committee to yield to his ideas. Hence, there is very often a deficiency of school-requisites, and books, and things of that kind, which the manager will not be able to get of his own motion, but when the Inspector comes in and says, "These things must be had; they are necessary to the efficiency of the school, and unless the school has them, the school will be struck off the list," immediately there



Nov. 25, 1868

The Rev.  
John Scott  
Percie

is a fresh stimulus put on, and a very useful one. Moreover, I think the Inspectors, so far as I know them, have been very kind and judicious. I have had occasion to speak most favourably of all the Inspectors who have been connected with my schools. They have been kind to the teachers, and at the same time they are strict in keeping them up to their duties.

18077. Are there any points in which you would suggest any alterations in the mode or system of inspection?—I cannot at this moment suggest any improvement, except that I think the Inspectors might be considerably multiplied with advantage.

18078. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In speaking so favourably of Inspectors, may I ask you do you refer to Inspectors of all religious denominations?—Of all religious denominations without exception.

18079. And you make no objection on the ground of religious denomination?—Oh! none whatever. I have had Roman Catholic Inspectors inspecting schools with which I am connected, and gentlemen of the Established Church, and never had one of my own denomination, and the school has always benefited by their attention to it.

18080. Mr. Wilson.—You stated that you considered it desirable to enlarge the salary of the teacher. Could you say to what extent or on what principle you would be disposed to enlarge it?—That is a question which I am not prepared to go into.

18081. You are aware that there are classes of teachers differently paid according to their class, under the National system?—Yes; and I approve of that very much.

18082. There is a graduation of payment from £18 to £23 a year. Would you be disposed to make the minimum or maximum higher, or to what way do you think it would be best affected?—I think with the salaries continued at their present amount and with the payment of bursaries that I have spoken of, and the additional income from school-fee and other sources, a great portion of the evil that I have complained of would be remedied.

18083. You stated that in connexion with one of your schools, that in Fountain-street, the mistress has a house?—She has.

18084. Do you think it would be desirable as a matter of general arrangement all over the country that there should be provided houses attached to the different schools as dwelling-houses?—I think there is no manager of a school but would agree with me, that it would be a great advantage to him to have it. In the case of the Fountain-street school, as I have mentioned, there is such a thing, but in connexion with the Stanhope-street school there is not; and I have sometimes found the inconvenience of it when wishing to speak to the teacher on something that required attention, in endeavouring to call at his or her lodgings and being sent about from one place to another a great deal of time was lost.

18085. But, looking at the general circumstances of the schools throughout the country in rural districts, do you think that there should be a residence attached to the school, and forming part and parcel of it?—Yes, I think so.

18086. That would be a desirable mode of enlarging the salary of the teacher?—It would be a very good way of making the situation more valuable.

18087. You have stated that you are favourable generally to united education, but that you are of opinion that the system has been drifting into denominationalism. So far as the Board is concerned, would you state the reasons that induced you to express in general terms that opinion?—Well, I may state to the Commission what I have already stated elsewhere. I will take a passage out of a paper, which was drawn up by the Resident Commissioner, in reply to a communication from certain of the Roman Catholic prelates. Now, this paper was not adopted by the Board; but I do not understand that any of the statements in it were contradicted by the Board. As far as I can judge from the proceedings which were laid before Parliament, it was simply a paper which the Commissioners

did not think it necessary to adopt or to send forward as their official reply. The Resident Commissioner, who undoubtedly has no good reason of becoming acquainted with the working of the system as any other living man, speaking of the model schools, says—“Had anything approaching to compulsion or dishonest inducement been held out to procure the attendance of Roman Catholic pupils at these (that is, the model) schools, much might have been said against them. But, so far from this being the case, the Commissioners have never refused to enrol, in the immediate neighbourhood of a model school, a well conducted rival school under Roman Catholic management, though well aware that it had been established for the express purpose of drawing away from the model school the Roman Catholic children attending it. And far so doing the Board has incurred the severe censure of many of its warmest Protestant supporters.” This is taken from the Parliamentary Paper 473 for the Session of 1867, third page.

18088. I did not wish to interrupt you in your answer; but you expressed your own opinion that the system was drifting into denominationalism, so far as the Board is concerned. Now, you have given Mr. Macdonnell's opinion; I want to hear your own?—Well, there is a fact stated by Mr. Macdonnell which shows to me that the Board has been enjoining denominational schools, with the view to put down these schools in which united education is most fully exemplified.

18089. Have you read the context of that letter of Mr. Macdonnell's—the immediate context in which he puts forward these views which you have just now expressed?—Would you have the goodness to take into connexion with it the immediate context?—I have read the context; I cannot say that I have it with me now; but I am sure there is nothing in the context to contradict the fact which is there expressly stated. But that is not the only point on which I rest my opinion. I consider that a great number of the non-vested schools are practically denominational schools. They are generally built in close connexion with churches, chapels, or meeting-houses; they are usually managed by the clergymen of these churches, chapels, or meeting-houses. The religious system favoured by those institutions is the only one that is allowed to be taught in these schools, and they are known in their respective neighbourhoods as the church school, the chapel school, &c. These are therefore practically denominational schools, for they are attended by scarcely any but by the members of the communities in connexion with which these churches or chapels are founded; and if they are attended by any others, it is usually from the want of other schools in the neighbourhood to which the children could be sent. I may illustrate a little further, the encouragement given by the Board to these denominational schools. I take the following from the Inspector's report on the Antrim district, for the year 1865. He says:—

“Two new schools were received into connexion early in the year. They are situated in the town of Larne, are in the same building, and are on the grounds of the Roman Catholic chapel. The house is a good one, and the teachers are of a superior class; but before their opening, there was ample school accommodation in the town, and there was an efficient staff of teachers. The new schools are exclusively attended by Roman Catholics, and their establishment has practically given a denominational character to the other schools, which have been by them deprived of their Roman Catholic pupils.”

This is from the Appendix to the Thirty-second Report of the Commissioners, Vol. I, page 295. That is a practice which has been going on throughout Ireland in various towns and places. Schools have been unnecessarily multiplied, in order to give to each denomination its own school, the practical result of which is, that the children, so far as depends on the Commissioners, are drawn away from the schools which they formerly attended in common, and are now kept almost as distinct from one another as if they lived on opposite sides of an arm of the sea. I may

Nov 28, 1862.

The Rev.  
John Scott  
Perin.

allude further to the encouragement that has been given to the convent schools, which are, and can be nothing else, but denominational. The ladies who teach in these convent schools, in many of them teach very well, in others, not quite so well, but in many of these convent schools the teaching is exceedingly good. But it is purely denominational, for the ladies attend there in the habits of their respective orders, with their crosses and crucifixes displayed, and the whole aspect of the place intimates decidedly that it has a connexion with one particular Church. I may refer to the answer that was given by the Lady Superior of the Westford convent, when the Inspector paid his visit to her (it is in the special reports, moved for by Mr. Mansell, and ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, on the 30th of June, 1864), and wanted to lead this lady to say that her school was a non-denominational one. The Inspector was Mr. Duggan, District Inspector. In his report upon the New Ross convent school No 2, belonging to the Order of Mercy, he says—

"Some, however, have observed to me that these and similar schools are denominational. The Superior herself pointed out to me her robe and dress and crucifix, saying, 'What is this but denominational?'"

This is in the 46th page of the returns upon the convent schools. The Inspector goes on to say—

"My answer is, there is no denominational teaching; the children see the same books, and receive the same kind of instruction as their Protestant fellows in purely mixed schools; and there is nothing taught which is the reverse degree tending to array one denomination against another."

The Inspector seems to consider that a sufficient answer to the Lady Superior's remark. In my opinion it was not.

18090. Now you have stated that amongst the circumstances that have led to the tendency to denominationalism is the fact that schools are built on sites connected with chapels, and other religious places of worship?—Yes.

18091. Are you not aware that in the early history of the Board, Protestant landlords in many parts of Ireland, especially in the North of Ireland, actually refused to allow any National school whatever to be built on their property, and that the only places, at least the only places available, were places connected with the sites of chapels, and that in that way a great number of these schools originated which you now complain of?—I know that has been stated, and by an authority which I cannot question, the late Archbishop Whately.

18092. Do you believe it is a fact?—I know that in some cases it is a fact.

18093. And do you think that so far as that circumstance goes the Board had anything to do with drifting into denominationalism?—I think that under circumstances of necessity the Board are not to be blamed, but what I complain of is, that where no such necessity exists, it has often been done.

18094. May I ask whether any and which of your schools are vested or non-vested?—All those that I have are non-vested.

18095. So far as the action of the Board is concerned, was it drifting into denominationalism to put your school into connexion?—I think it was.

18096. At whose instance was it that the Board took your schools into connexion?—With regard to the schools that are now in Stanshope-street I applied to the Board myself, and I will tell you the nature of the application I made. I stated that these schools were under the management of a committee, the Committee of Domestic Missions to the Poor of Belfast, and though that was not a thing that I was required to state by the query sheet that was sent down to me, I put a special paragraph in, mentioning that in the school-room religious service was carried on on Sunday evenings for the benefit of such of the parents of the children as wished to attend, and were not connected with other places of worship, or something to that effect. The Board wrote down to me through their Secretaries that this was contrary to their rules, and that they

could not take the schools into connexion. Well, then I wrote a reply to the Board, along with which I sent up a report of a religious society in Belfast which is called the Town Mission Society, in the appendix to which was given a list of the places in which religious services were carried on on Sunday evenings for the benefit of the same class of people; and among the places thus specified were six National schools, and I further pointed out that among the list of subscribers to that Town Mission appeared the names of two of the Commissioners themselves, the Rev. Dr. Henry of Belfast, and James O'Hanlon, esq., &c. And with reference to this, I state explicitly that I think it is a privilege that ought not to be granted either to the Town Mission or to me, but if it be granted to the one, I think that fair play requires that it should be granted to the other. The permission was granted accordingly. However since that time I have procured another chapel to be built for the benefit of my Domestic Mission; and the schools have now no connexion with any such institution.

18097. You applied, however, to have non-vested schools taken into connexion with the Board?—I did.

18098. And do you consider that you yourself were drifting into denominationalism when you so applied?—I consider that the system had drifted into denominationalism, and that I simply availed myself of a privilege which I did not approve of being granted to any, but which I thought it would be fair play to refuse to me after granting it to others, including two of the Commissioners themselves.

18099. When others became denominational you became denominational also?—I have stated the facts.

18100. You are aware, I presume, that in non-vested schools the patrons have always claimed the right to make what use they pleased of the schools on Sunday for Sabbath school teaching, provided it was not likely to excite any bad feeling?—That is in the rules.

18101. Have you ever taken advantage of that, and made your schools Sabbath schools?—Yes, I have. I carried on a Bible class for the children of my own congregation in the Fountain-street school for a time; and there is still a Sunday school carried on in the Stanshope-street school.

18102. Now, whether it is your opinion that the denominationalism you complain of has been the result of the action of the Board, or the result of the religious feeling amongst the community at large?—I don't think there is any religious feeling amongst the community at large at all upon the subject. I think there is a feeling among sectarian persons, and that those ecclesiastical persons exercise a great deal of influence on the public mind, but I never found the slightest objection to the united system on the part of the poor of any class or denomination whatsoever.

18103. Does it consist with your knowledge that parents as a general principle are much more disposed to send their children to schools the patron of which is of their own denomination, than to schools the patron of which is of a different denomination?—My experience is the reverse. I have and the vast majority of the children attending my schools are of a different denomination and different religious opinions from me, yet there is no want of schools connected with their own churches and chapels.

18104. I think you stated that there was one exception, that there were no children of one particular denomination in your schools?—A few. There are a few Catholics still in attendance, at first there was a great number of Roman Catholics, but those were ordered away. Bishop Derrin denounced those schools. I do not mean that he denounced mine by name, but he denounced schools such as mine from the altar, and exhorted his people to take their children away from them, and immediately upon that being done there was a very great reduction indeed in the number of Roman Catholics. I beg to add to my answer that, that a Catholic clergyman came to the Fountain-street school,

and inspected the school register, and took down the names and addresses of all the Roman Catholic children (they are all entered R.C. in the register), and it was immediately after that that the denunciation in the attendance took place. No doubt whatsoever, denunciations were paid. Several of those children that were taken away went to no school whatsoever. Some of them, when spoken to by their school-fellows, said, so at least the latter stated to the mistress, that the priest had ordered them not to go. It is manifest that the children would have come, and the parents would have let them come without hesitation, if they had been let alone.

18105. Do you mean that parents of a class of Presbyterians different from that to which you belong would send their children with the same confidence to your school?—I will put it in the strongest way—as they would to a school conducted by a patron of the same religion with themselves?—All I can say is that within twenty yards of the Stonehouse-street school there has been a Presbyterian school, attached to a Presbyterian chapel, erected by the congregation and endowed by the Board; and there still is a respectable number of the children belonging to that very congregation attending any school.

18106. Where parents are left to themselves do children attend schools where the parents think they will get the best teaching, irrespective of the religious denomination of the patron?—I think that would be largely the feeling. That is decidedly my impression with respect to the state of feeling—that it is the kindness and attention the children receive, I do not speak of gratuities or entertainments given to the children, but the kindly parental treatment they experience in the schools; the attention given to their lessons, to their manners, to their cleanliness, and to their behaviour, and the orderly habits which are impressed upon them—that these, along with their improvement in learning, are the things which parents look to, and not whether the teacher is a man of my Church or of your Church.

18107. We will suppose that there are a number of parents that are induced, from whatever cause it may be, to withdraw their children from your school, and from schools such as yours, and to refuse to allow their children to go to your school, do you think that the Board would exercise a wise discretion in refusing to give a grant to a school attended by those children whose parents are induced to withdraw their children from your schools; suppose, always, there was a sufficient number of children found willing to go to this other school that I speak of, and that that school would be conducted upon the principles of the united system?—The question assumes the continuance and the perpetuity of the denominational system.

18108. I am assuming the very state of facts which you state to exist, namely, that children are withdrawn, by influence exerted upon their parents, from schools of a pure character such as yours, and in sufficient numbers to warrant a school being established which might have the confidence of those children, and the school to be conducted under the National Board, and under a patron in whom the parents would have every confidence, do you think that the Board would be justified in refusing to give a grant or salary?—I think I have already intimated, but if I have not, I now beg distinctly to express my opinion that all those denominational schools should be swept away, and that there should be no such thing as a Catholic school, no such thing as a Protestant school, or a Wesleyan school, or a Unitarian school, or a school belonging to any of those denominations; that they should all be precisely upon the same footing as the model schools, of which the National Board is itself, in its corporate capacity, the patron and proprietor; and that all connexion of schools with particular denominations should at once be put an end to.

18109. Do you think that because a school is attended altogether by children of one denomination, therefore it is a denominational school?—I say if there be a mixture of schools in the same neighbour-

hood, and if one is attended exclusively by children of one denomination, another exclusively by children of a second, and another exclusively by children of a third, that these schools are denominational, and that they are denominationalising the people. But I admit that there may be circumstances in which one school is insufficient for the wants of a neighbourhood. In that case it may be absolutely necessary that children should attend to the instruction of teachers not of their own way of thinking, and I do not consider that there is anything denominational in that.

18110. Do you consider a school in a parish where there are none but Roman Catholics, conducted on the principles of the National Board, a denominational school?—I do not, if there are none but Roman Catholics.

18111. Take the case of schools in Belfast where there are a great number of Roman Catholics, the population of Belfast consisting of Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and members of the Established Church, some of these schools being under Roman Catholic patrons, some under Presbyterian patrons, some under Episcopalian patrons, and the children going, the Roman Catholics to one, the Presbyterians to another, and the Episcopalsians to another, and all of these schools being conducted on the principles of the National Board, do you consider that these schools are all denominational?—Distinctly and absolutely, and an end should be put to that whole system.

18112. Then in point of fact it is the attendance of the children at the school that in your opinion makes it denominational, and not the character of the teaching?—No, it is the character of the patronage and of the management, and the character of the attendance taken together, thus dividing the children into sects and parties from their earliest years.

18113. There are some Protestant gentlemen in Ireland patrons of schools, the children attending which are altogether Roman Catholics, do you consider that in this case the school is denominational, the patron being of one denomination, and the children attending it being altogether of another denomination?—That question answers itself. It cannot be considered as denominational. But I beg to say again and again, and I wish the learned Commissioner would give me credit for believing what I have said, which is this, that I think that whole system of local patrons and private managers ought to be swept away.

18114. Then under what management would you place the schools?—Under the management of paid or unpaid Commissioners of Education, just the same management as the model schools.

18115. Then you would allow no gentleman having built a school on his own property, to become the patron and manager of that school?—Certainly not. If he chooses to hand it over to the Commissioners let him do so. If he chooses to retain the management of it let him support it out of his own funds.

18116. The Chairman.—Then you would have no local management at all to look after the teacher?—I would have local inspection, but no authority; neither the appointment of the teacher nor the regulation of the time table, nor the system of instruction commenced in the school, should be under any local management whatever.

18117. Mr. Gillen.—What do you mean by local inspection?—I mean that every person who has an interest in the prosperity of the school should have an opportunity of going in and seeing how it is managed; and, if necessary, of making his report either to the Inspector of the Board, or to the Board itself.

18118. Is that not exactly the state of things under the existing rules of the Board, that any member of the community has a right to go into the school and see how it is conducted, and enter upon the Visitor's Book any report which he may consider the school calls for; and to make any representation to the Commissioners, in Dublin, that he thinks necessary?—That is exactly the state of things, and my answer was intended to say that I did not wish that state of things to be altered.

No. 25, 1868.  
—  
The Rev.  
John Scott  
Porter.

Nov. 25, 1886.

The Rev.  
John Scott  
Parker.

18119. But would you give no right of patronage or management to any local party?—None whatsoever. I would have every school under the Board conducted precisely upon the same footing as the model schools are at present.

18120. You are aware, I suppose, that there are several model schools that are attended exclusively by one denomination?—I am aware of it, on regards one or two of the model schools.

18121. Are you aware, for instance, that at Drumcree there is a model school which is attended altogether by Roman Catholics?—I have not looked into the reports with regard to the Drumcree model school specially, nor can I pretend to have everything that is in the twenty-two volumes that the Commissioners have published present in my head at once; but I know this, that there is no local patron there; no local person has any right to appoint any teacher, or to regulate any teaching that is given there. It is entirely under the authority of the Board, being a model school.

18122. Rev. Dr. W'ham—Have you turned your attention to the constitution of the present Board of the Commissioners of National Education?—Very particularly.

18123. Do you approve of the Board, as at present constituted, and of the principle on which it is constituted?—I disapprove of both.

18124. On what grounds?—I think, in the first place, it is a great deal too numerous to be an administrative Board. It consists, I think, when the members are full, at twenty Commissioners, and I do not think there is an administrative Board in the United Kingdom, under the Crown, consisting of that number of Commissioners except itself, so far as I am aware. The Post Office is under the Postmaster-General—one officer; the Constabulary is under one Commissioner-in-Chief; the inland Revenue, and the Customs, are under a small Board. I conceive that a Board of twenty members is not able to do the business. If the members were the ablest men in the world, the very number of them would impede them for doing business, and I think that a Board of five, or, at most, five members, would be quite sufficient to do the duty. These ought to devote their whole time to the duty. They ought to be appointed as other Government Boards are, upon the responsibility of the ministers of the Crown, and they should be well remunerated for the services they give; and I think that a liberal remuneration would be wise economy in a case of that kind.

18125. You should not think £1000 a year to each of five paid Commissioners too much, I suppose?—I should think it too little. I would give double that.

18126. Have you turned your attention to the action of the Commissioners generally, in administering the system of education, has it been uniform, in your opinion?—It has been very much the reverse, but I was going to speak of the constitution of the Board, not merely in regard to its number, but also in regard to the principle upon which these gentlemen are appointed. It has been laid down that one half of the Board shall consist of members of different Protestant Churches, and one half shall consist of Roman Catholics. Now, in my opinion, that is a qualification and a disqualification, that ought to be swept away. If there was a small Board appointed, it ought to be appointed at the option of the Government, for the case being, and its members ought to be selected from any denomination in which the most suitable persons could be found to undertake the duty, and to do it faithfully; and I should not care, in that case, whether they were all Roman Catholics, or all Protestants of the Established Church, or of any other Church different from my own; I should have confidence in them, just as I should have perfect confidence in going with a case before the Court of Common Pleas, where there are four Roman Catholic Judges sitting; I am satisfied that I should have my case fairly tried; and honestly decided; and I should have the same confidence with regard to the Commission of Education, if it was left as it ought to be—

open, with no more restriction imposed upon the religious profession, or belief, of its members, than there is upon the religious profession or belief of a Judge in any of Her Majesty's Courts of Common Law. That is my great objection to the Board. One result of the enlargement and intermixture both, has been that the persons who attend there have considered themselves, in some respects, as representatives of their respective Churches, in consequence of which, I believe, there have been very frequent discussions among them, with considerable acrimony on one side or other, or both; and protests have been handed in by dissentient minorities, which have been laid before Parliament, against some of the decisions.

18127. Could it be expected that it should be otherwise, if these men regard themselves as representing Churches, and religious interests of different religious denominations?—I do not think it could be otherwise.

18128. Now, could it be supposed that such a Board would not work uniformly in the administration of a system?—I do not think it has acted with uniformity. I think that Board has repeatedly violated its own rules.

18129. Can you give any instances?—I think I can. There is one of the rules that the Board is not to correspond directly with the teachers of any National school, that the correspondence is to go through the local patron or manager. In direct violation of that rule, upon two occasions papers were sent down to the teachers in schools connected with me, sent down directly from the Board without passing through my hands at all. I did not know that those papers were in existence until going into the school incidentally for other purposes, I found them there, with a stringent order that the teacher was to make a particular use of them. Now, I say that is a direct violation of the rule which is upon the face of the "Rules and Regulations" of the Board. Again, it is one of the rules of the Board, that in unbuilding convent schools the Commissioners will grant aid to one school only in connection with the same convent. Now, in direct violation of that, I would point to a case in the returns ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on the 20th of June, 1884. In those returns there is a report upon the Raggle-street Convent National school, connected with the Sisters of Mercy; the report is signed by Timothy Sheahan, "Head-Inspector, and a Roman Catholic." Those words are below his name. Mr. Sheahan says—"There are branch convents established at Glenties, Blackrock, Booterstown, Goldenbridge, and Longford, by name sent out from this, the centre house; and in connexion with all, there are National schools conducted by nuns who had long experience as teachers in this school. Now upon the Booterstown school—"

18130. Mr. Sullivan—Do you mean to say that the last case is an exception to the rule of the Board?—No; but I was wishing to take it into account with another statement that occurs further on. From Mr. Sheahan's report it appears then that the Booterstown Convent is an emanation from the Raggle-street one. Then I go to read from the report upon the Blackrock Female Convent National School in which the Inspector, Mr. MacDonagh, "District Inspector, and a Roman Catholic," says—"the teaching power (adult) is not quite adequate, two nuns who come to the school daily from Booterstown Convent, having an average attendance at some periods of 125 under their care." Thus you see Booterstown Convent is an emanation from Raggle-street. Booterstown Convent has a school of its own, which is reported upon by Mr. MacDonagh, District Inspector (p. 67). But in addition to the school of its own in Booterstown it sends out two of its members to Blackrock who conduct the school there, which I say is contrary to the rule of the Board.

18131. What is the name of the Blackrock school?—"The Blackrock Female Convent National School, county of Dublin; roll number, 721, under the Sisters of Mercy; manager, the Very Rev. Canon Poole."

18132. Are you not aware that all the convents

throughout the different countries of Europe acknowledge one another convent as the root from which they all strike out?—I have nothing to do with what takes place all over Europe.

18133. Are you aware of that—that is the question?—Of course I am aware of it, but I have nothing to do with it here. I should like to answer that question by saying that I believe most of the continental convents are so; but I could not undertake to swear.

18134. Do you consider that a convent which acknowledges another convent as its mother convent is not a separate convent?—I consider that when the rule of the Board says that there shall be only one school salaried in connexion with each convent, and when I find that there is a school salaried in connexion with Boostenstown Convent in Boostenstown, and when I find that there is another school salaried in connexion with the Boostenstown school in Blackrock, there is a violation of the rule.

18135. Blackrock Convent School?—There is no Blackrock Convent so far as it appears.

18136. I think you stated that there was a Blackrock Convent School?—It is a convent school, but there is no convent.

18137. Is there no convent in Blackrock?—None connected with the school No. 721. I find it stated here that two Sisters came to the school daily from Boostenstown, having an average attendance at some periods of 125 under their care, and I find that this school is managed by the Very Rev. Canon Forde of Boostenstown, and I find that the Boostenstown school is managed by the Very Rev. L. Forde, parish priest of Boostenstown.

18138. Are you quite certain that the Boostenstown Convent referred to there is the one from which the schoolmistresses are taken of your own knowledge?—I don't know it of my own knowledge. I take this from the report, but I was never in Boostenstown in my life, so far as I know.

18139. Then you are not aware whether there are one, two, three, four, or five convents in Boostenstown?—That is a very ingenious suggestion, but I apprehend it would not hold water with any sensible man.

18140. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Specify what you point out as a breach of the rule to which you refer?—It is just this, that there is a school in Blackrock and a school in Boostenstown which are both reported and set down here in this book of returns as being under one and the same convent. That is a violation of the rule.

18141. Mr. Sullivan.—Allow me to repeat my question, do you know as a matter of fact whether there be or be not more than one convent in the district?—I have said already that I do not know it of my own knowledge. How could I know it of my own knowledge when I have stated that I never was in Boostenstown in my life, so far as I know? I may have passed through it without my knowledge.

18142. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you any other cases of breach of rule by the Commissioners themselves?—Oh, yes, I have.

18143. Mention the cases?—There is a return of the Newtownards Convent National School, roll number, 4,515. There can be no doubt that there is a convent school there. The name of that school send out two of their own number to another school in the neighbourhood.

18144. Judge Morris.—What is the name of the school?—St. Nicholas Convent School, county Galway; roll number, 6,613. There is a report upon this St. Nicholas Convent School from which I take an extract.—“The ladies in charge belong to the Mercy Convent, Galway, on whose school at Newtownards I have been reported, and they remain at St. Nicholas during business hours only. Finding some time since that an ordinary National school had fallen here, they came to the rescue, and have now, so great is their skill and such their power of attraction, an average of over 200 poor children, few of whom would attend at an ordinary school, to whom they impart the blessings of religious instruction, moral training, and secular

education.” And from the 33rd Report of the Commissioners of Education, I find that both these schools are still connected with the Board. The Newtownards school having received of the public funds during the year 1884 the sum of £211 1s. 8d., and that of St. Nicholas £86 6s. 8d.

18145. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—But should you not say that there was a positive gain to the community by such a result as that?—No doubt, but there was a breach of the rule, which is the point under consideration.

18146. Are they not separate schools in separate convents—a school in each convent?—There is no convent whatever in the last-mentioned place—at least there is none reported here.

18147. Rev. Mr. Corrie.—Is not St. Nicholas a parish of Galway?—It may be; if so it is a more distant breach of the rule.

18148. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You have suggested a small Board. Of what character should it be—administrative or legislative?—Administrative. Its powers and functions should be strictly fixed by Act of Parliament. At present the Board is partly administrative and partly legislative, and the legislation is carried on in the very worst way in which it is possible to be carried on, namely, in private, without those who are legislated for having the least knowledge of what is going on, until a rule comes out which sometimes affects their interests and the interests of the country very materially. There is no right of petition, no public debate or discussion; all is done in private.

18149. On what principle should you say such a Board should administer the system?—The principle should be strictly non-sectarian.

18150. Where do you find that principle best exemplified in connexion with the National system of education?—In the model schools.

18151. Are all the religious denominations thoroughly represented there?—I have paid some attention to that point, and have gone through a number of the reports of the National Board with a view to see how the teaching staff was organized in different model schools under the Board, and, so far as the reports are given, they are singularly well circumstanced in that respect. For example, I take the following from Mr. Paterson's report on the Clonmel District Model School. He says: “The principal of the boys' school is a Roman Catholic, his assistant is a member of the Established Church. In the girls' school the principal is a Roman Catholic; her assistant is a Non-Subscribing Presbyterian. In the infants' school there is only one teacher, who is of the Established Church.” Again, take the Kilkenny District Model School. “The principal in the boys' school is a Roman Catholic, his assistant is a Presbyterian. In the girls' school the principal teacher is a Roman Catholic; her assistant is a member of the Established Church. In the infants' school the principal is of the Established Church, and her assistant is a Roman Catholic.” So also with regard to the Waterford school, the Enniscorthy school, the Parnassus school, and I know it to be the case with several others.

18152. For what do you regard these model schools as especially valuable?—I regard them as exceedingly valuable in the first instance for showing how a good, well-regulated school should be conducted, what sort of buildings are necessary for the purpose, what sort of school furniture, maps, desks, and appliances for teaching are necessary, how the different classes should be organized with a view of preserving order and at the same time promoting efficiency in teaching; that is one point of view in which I think them exceedingly valuable. Another point of view in which I think they are very valuable is as an illustration of the happiness and success with which the united principle can be carried practically into operation. The reports of the District Inspectors and Head Inspectors on these schools, which are annually published, have, I may say, universally, whenever the subject is touched upon, been particularly favourable to them in that

No. 25, 1885

—  
The Rev.  
John Scott  
Parish.

Nov. 26, 1892  
 The Rev.  
 John Scott  
 Parson.

point of view. A third point of view in which I consider the model schools very valuable is their usefulness as training places for teachers. The junior teachers brought up in them have, generally speaking, received a much better education, and generally speaking, also, they have a better knowledge of school discipline and management than those who came from the ordinary National schools.

18153. Are you aware it has been stated that the Commissioners of National Education have changed their opinion on that subject?—Does the question relate to the creation of these schools?

18154. Not the creation of the schools, but their application as training schools?—I have a great deal to say on that point. An "explanatory paper" was submitted some time ago by the Commissioners to Her Majesty's Government, in which it was stated—I quote the words—"The district model schools never were intended to be training establishments for teachers." Now this statement is singularly incorrect, coming from persons who ought to have known the nature of the system under their own management.

18155. How do you establish that?—In the first place, in the Second Report of the Commissioners themselves, dated June, 1855, the Commissioners announced that in addition to their central training establishment it was their intention as soon as funds should be placed at their disposal for the purpose, to establish thirty-two district model schools, and to enact that each candidate for admission into the training establishment should undergo a preparatory training in one of these. They were, therefore, recognised places, at least of preparatory training. Secondly, in the Commissioners' Form of Lease, drawn up by the Commissioners themselves, and printed annually in their reports, by which schoolhouses may be vested in trustees, for the purpose of National education, there is a clause providing that all teachers, male and female, teaching in schools connected with the Board, shall either after their appointment or previously hold themselves in readiness when called upon "to attend at the general normal school established in Dublin, or at one of the district model schools hereafter to be opened." I quote from the collected reports, volume I, page 210. A similar clause is inserted in the Form of Lease conveying school premises to the Board itself in the corporate capacity, almost in the same terms, if not exactly; and for the last fourteen years a paragraph has been constantly inserted in the rules and regulations of the Board, as published and laid before Parliament from year to year, stating that the chief objects of the district model schools are "to promote united education, to exhibit the most improved methods of history and scientific instruction, and to train young persons for the office of teacher," and that clause, I may say, keeps its place in the last edition of the rules of the Board. It is found in the revised rules of 1863, which were agreed to by the Board not more than three months before the date of the explanatory paper. And in the same set of rules—that is, the rules of 1863—the following passage occurs—"The pupil teachers of district model schools on taking charge of National schools after completion of their course of training shall, if not already classed, rank as third-class teachers, provided they be deemed qualified." And again, in the query sheet, which is sent to all managers of schools at the end of each quarter, and which must be filled up before the salaries for the quarter are paid, the tenth query is, "If the new teacher has been trained in the central or any of the district model schools, state which of them and for what period." Now, there are upwards of 6,000 schools in connection with the Board, and to each of them a copy of that query sheet is sent once a quarter, which would make about 25,000 copies of it published by the Board itself, every year, and the knowledge of these model schools were ordered to be so constructed that they should each afford accommodation for eight pupil teachers, who were to be allowed board and taught for twelve months, at the end of which period each of the candidates as had passed with credit through their course of training in the dis-

trict model school were to be recommended by the Superintendent to those patrons of schools who applied for teachers, and in conformity with this I find that in very many of the reports of the Head Inspectors upon the state and efficiency of these schools, the number of the pupil teachers whom they had sent out qualified to take charge, either as teachers or assistant teachers of local schools, is stated and commented upon, and the prospects of the supply coming from that quarter are discussed; and, therefore, I say, that if it be asserted by anyone, I don't care by whom, that the district model schools were "never intended as training places for teachers," the statement is made in very gross error.

18156. Mr. Gibson.—With reference to that, do you make a distinction between a trained teacher and a pupil teacher in a model school that is trained as a teacher?—None whatever. The pupil teacher is a person in a state of pupillage, with a view to becoming a teacher.

18157. I have put the distinction before you and you do not recognise it.—The Commissioner will remember I am on my oath and that it is my duty to explain myself.

18158. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You regard, as one main design from the first of these model schools, that of training persons for the office of teacher?—Yes; I have not the slightest doubt of it. It is stated by the Commissioners themselves that the object is to exhibit the most approved methods of teaching, "and to train young persons for the office of teachers."

18159. Then am I to understand that your surprise now is owing to the statement lately made by the Commissioners, that they never designed these places as training institutions?—Certainly.

18160. Have you any idea as to the circumstances under which they made such a statement?—I have heard reports, but reports of what takes place at the Board I would rather not mention, as I know nothing about them of my own knowledge. It is just as well that the fact, if it be a fact, should be stated by some of those who were present.

18161. Are you not aware that lately a very large diminution of one class of the community has taken place in connection with the attendance of children at these model schools?—A very large diminution indeed; and here I may take an opportunity of correcting a statement I made in a pamphlet I published the time last year. In that pamphlet I stated that though the Roman Catholic bishop and his clergy had not themselves decidedly in opposition to the model school in Belfast, yet that an augmentation of the Roman Catholic pupils had taken place within the preceding twelve months. In that statement I was incorrect. I was led, however, into the incorrectness by the manner in which the Commissioners printed their returns from the model schools for that year. In the preceding year they gave the number of children in attendance at the model schools belonging to the different religious denominations, that of Belfast included. In the last report which I had seen there was a similar table, apparently similar in all respects, and seemingly designed for comparison with it, but giving larger totals. However, my attention was called to my statement by one of the teachers of the model school in Belfast, and by further inquiry it appears, that the numbers given in the first report were the numbers that attended for the quarter ended 31st December, 1865, while in the corresponding table, in the report for 1866, the table stated the religious denominations of the children on the rolls of the Belfast model school for the year ending 31st Dec., 1866. Not having attended to this circumstance, I fell into a mistake. I can now give the real number for those two years.

18162. We need not dwell upon that. Now, is it your opinion that the Commissioners of Education have themselves upheld these institutions as they should have done?—In my opinion decidedly not. I think the paragraph I have read from the paper proposed by the Resident Commissioner shows that they have not done so.

18163. As an upholder of the non-sectarian or united system of education, state some of the advantages resulting from that system over a denominational one?—I conserve it has a very great advantage by bringing children of different sects and denominations into friendly contact in the early period of their lives, whereby they form friendships with one another, and these may, and often have, continued to afterlife, to the great advantage of the community in softening down asperities and promoting peace and order. I think the home of our country is the tendency to sectarian division that exists, especially in the lower ranks of the community, and that the object of the National system ought to be, so far as it interferes with that principle at all, to put an end to it, and I think that is best done by the united or non-sectarian system.

18164. Can you testify, as a matter of fact, that that result has taken place from this system of education?—I know in all the schools under my charge the most perfect harmony has prevailed upon the subject of religion. I do not think a harsh or unkind word has ever been uttered by any child within the precincts of these establishments, or so far as I know on their way to or from school. That, I consider, to be a very decided testimony.

18165. Should you regard that as a positive gain to the State itself?—Certainly.

18166. In a pamphlet of yours I see you have quoted the testimony of two Roman Catholic Head Inspectors on that subject?—I have.

18167. Have you heard other Inspectors giving similar testimony to that given by Head Inspector Sheehan and Head Inspector Fleming?—I have conversed with no Inspector who did not view this as one of the excellencies of the non-denominational system, and speak of it as such; and I know, among the persons with whom I mix in society, there is a very great and growing conviction of the reality of that effect, and its vast importance, and that conviction is spreading to many persons who did not formerly entertain it, or did not, at least, see its strength.

18168. If a denominational system were established granting in country districts two schools, one a Roman Catholic school, with Roman Catholic manager, a Roman Catholic teacher, and Roman Catholic children, and the other a Protestant school, with a Protestant manager, a Protestant teacher, and Protestant children, what do you think would be the opinion of parties in the North of Ireland, with which I presume you are most familiar, in reference to such a system?—Those parties with whom I am most familiar would undoubtedly look upon it as tending to disastrous consequences.

18169. I see a statement here purporting to come from the Ulster National Education Association, in that association composed of parties of different religious denominations?—It is, as may be seen from the list of members of its committee.

18170. May I ask are they representatives of the Protestant denominations only?—Yes, Protestant denominations only; I do not see any Roman Catholics amongst them.

18171. But they represent all the Protestant denominations?—Yes, Episcopalian, Presbyterian connected with the General Assembly, Wesleyan Methodists, Methodists of other denominations, Non-Subscribing Presbyterians—in fact I may say every denomination of Protestants.

18172. From having mixed with them, would you say that they would be totally opposed to such a denominational system as I have just now sketched?—They were decidedly opposed to it in 1864, and I think that if they wished to be consistent with themselves, they ought to be opposed to it now; but I cannot say what changes may have come over the minds of some of them. I do not know of any change of opinion among them.

18173. Should you think it a prudent course to establish a system in one part of the country denominational, and in another united and non-sectarian in

the same country, and administered by the same Board?—I think it would be absurd—pulling down and building up at the same time. If the denominational system is the best, let the Government establish it and carry it out. If the anti-denominational is the best, let the Government establish it, and carry it out; but I cannot see any advantage in this balancing and counterbalancing in different parts of the country.

18174. What effect would that have upon the State, would it increase the burden of the State in any way to establish denominational schools?—Undoubtedly it would. If one good non-denominational school is established like a model school, it should do for the children of that entire district, leaving, of course, perfect freedom to persons who do not feel to avail themselves of it, to found other establishments at their own expense; but if you begin to establish a denominational school here, another there, and another there, you are put to the expense of three separate buildings and three separate staffs of teachers, and after all you have probably got three very inefficient schools, for there is no doubt the efficiency of a school depends, in a great degree, on the number of scholars attending it.

18175. Are there not parts of the North of Ireland where the number of denominations is such that three schools would not suffice?—Certainly.

18176. Would you think it fair that the Roman Catholics, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian, should each have a school of their own, and that the Primitive Wesleyans, Independents, and others should not have schools of their own on the same terms?—I should think it very unfair indeed, but, at the same time, it would be almost impossible. The poor connected with some of these denominations are too few in their particular localities to support a school; but because they are few they ought not to be overlooked, yet the establishment of a school for a very small number of children, would be a perfect anomaly.

18177. Mr. O'Brien—I think you stated in the earlier part of your evidence that in your opinion the Board ought not to be a mixed one as regarded religious denominations?—Rather that it need not be so.

18178. You are familiar, I suppose, with the letter of Lord Stanley upon which the Board was constituted?—I am.

18179. He states that—"To attain the first object it appears essential that the Board should be composed of men of high personal character, including individuals of exalted station in the Church, to obtain the latter, that it should consist of persons of different religious opinions?"—Undoubtedly Mr. Stanley did state that, but my opinion is directly the reverse. I differ from Mr. Stanley on that point.

18180. You have stated in one of the peculiar features of recommendation in the model schools that the teaching staffs employed in them were composed of individuals representing the different denominations of the community—Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, and others?—Yes.

18181. How do you reconcile that—you regard a mixed staff of teachers in a model school as an advantage, yet you object to a Board of mixed individuals, representing the aims of the different sects in one common purpose and having one common end?—I do not object to a Board so constituted; though I do not see the necessity of laying it down as a law that it shall never be otherwise constituted. I approve of the intermixture of teachers of different denominations, when practicable, because the teachers being of different denominations will be as it were sentinels placed there, and will give confidence to the parents of the poor children in the neighbourhood, who generally know very little, and care very little, about the religious denominations of the Commissioners, but who may perhaps be uneasy lest, in this or that school, their children may, under the influence of this or that teacher be indoctrinated with erroneous opinions. The object of having teachers of different denominations is to do away with all suspicion of that nature, and it will be remembered that in speaking of the Board, I speak of it as a purely administrative Board, having

Nov. 25, 1898.  
The Rev.  
John Scott  
Porter.

an Act of Parliament for its guidance and obliged to comply with that Act of Parliament just as any other administrative Board—such as the Customs, the Inland Revenue, the Post Office, or any other department of the public service.

18182. You do not think the same principle applies to the Board, in order to give confidence to the community at large as applies to a school?—No; I think if the Board is composed of persons of high character, known and for the cause of education, anxious to promote it, and able to promote it, it makes no difference whatsoever what religious denomination they belong to.

18183. You referred to religious squabbles of the Board. Have the gentlemen to say on what occasion did you refer to take place?—“Religious” squabbles I did not call them. I did refer to squabbles taking place at the Board, but of course, I can only speak of those the results of which came before the public.

18184. Mention what you refer to?—I remember the time Archbishop Whately retired from the Board with some of his colleagues, on the ground that the principle and practice of the Board with reference to the books to be used in the hours for mixed or general instruction had been departed from in the case of the Clerical model school, and I believe some other—and departed from by a consent entered into between the Resident Commissioner and the Inspector who had charge of the model school, without any reference to or authority from the Board itself. This I understood was the ground of his Grace's retirement from the Board.

18185. I rather think you are mistaken about that?—Of course you can give your testimony; I am giving mine.

18186. Are you not aware that he retired from the Board on account of the rejection of one of his propositions from the list of the Board's books?—I am aware he objected to that—quite aware of it; but in my opinion the intermeddling with the principle of the Board in the Clerical model school was the main ground of his retirement. That is my impression.

18187. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Do you think the State is bound to provide religious education for the people?—Certainly not.

18188. Do you think the State is bound to provide secular education for those who cannot otherwise obtain it?—I think it is for the good of the State to do so; and so far as it is the duty of the State to do what is for the good of its people, the State is bound to provide it.

18189. Then do you think that all should promote such an object?—I think so.

18190. Do you think the State should provide a good secular education for every child in the land?—Yes.

18191. Would not such a system be carried out efficiently by the State providing and paying well for that secular instruction only?—In my apprehension, it should not only provide and pay for that secular instruction, and for that secular instruction only, but it should take care that the institutions which are erected for the communication of that secular instruction be not applied to any other purpose.

18192. Do you consider education confined only to secular instruction?—Very far from it indeed.

18193. Then ought not every manager of a school to supply to the children the religious instruction which their parents approve of?—I think it is the duty of the parents and the duty of the parent's Church to supply that religious education to the children.

18194. Is it not a matter which is purely in the control of the parent—how his child should be educated religiously?—I should say so.

18195. Therefore, the State really has nothing to do with it?—That is my decided opinion.

18196. And if a system could be devised by which the State secured good secular instruction for every child, leaving the religious question to be entirely settled between the parents of the children and the managers

of the school—would not such a system meet your views?—No; the managers of a school receiving aid from the public fund for the school they are carrying on, should be strictly bound to apply that school purely and exclusively to the object for which the money was granted; and in truth it is the duty, in my opinion, of the parent to take care his child is properly educated in religion, and it is the duty of the officers of his Church to assist him in that duty as far as they possibly can; and I should say that, under the wide dissemination of the Sunday-school system in the United Kingdom, there is not only no occasion for introducing into our daily schools what is called religious instruction, but what I should call rather “polemic instruction,” or “controversial theology.”—There is not only no necessity for it, but it is a very great disadvantage, as it deprives the State of a great deal of the power it would have for making enlightened, useful, and virtuous citizens.

18197. That may be your opinion; but suppose a large portion of the nation thought dogmatic instruction was an essential and important part of religious instruction, would you exclude them from every benefit of the public grant?—Of course I should, in that case, be out-voted. I have been out-voted many times before now, and I hope I shall live to be in many minorities yet.

18198. Do you think in the state of public opinion in this country that those portions of the community who consider that dogmatic instruction is an essential part of religious instruction should be excluded?—They should provide that instruction themselves, and not call on me and others like me who differ from it to pay the expense of it.

18199. According to your view ought not the State to give every facility for imparting religious instruction to the children according to the wishes of their parents, short of paying for it?—I think I have answered that question before.

18200. Is not that principle essential to liberty of conscience?—I see no objection to it, provided the religious instruction be administered at such a time and place that it shall neither be nor appear to be connected with the National system, and I would add further, not only at such a time and place but by such persons as that it shall not appear to be connected with the National system.

18201. Is any religious instruction given in your schools?—There is.

18202. At what time?—During the hour from ten to eleven.

18203. Did the Board in any way contribute to the building of your schools?—Not a penny.

18204. Does it contribute to their maintenance?—It does so far as salaries and school expenses.

18205. Then you are making use to a certain extent of the means afforded by the State for carrying on religious instruction?—Undoubtedly; but I say that is a system which should be put an end to.

18206. But supposing I were to agree with you on that point, yet if there is an immense proportion of the inhabitants of the country who think otherwise, is it not necessary the administration of the public funds should be so made as to meet the wants of the majority, even though it may be not the most perfect system?—It is the common rule of freedom that the majority should decide.

18207. If that rule were applied to Ireland would not the denominational system prevail?—I think it would not; if you took the unbiased opinion of the majority.

18208. But we have no means of ascertaining that?—I am sure it would prevail if the opinions of churchmen are to be taken as the opinions of members of their Church, which are very different things.

18209. You say their unbiased opinions, but we have no means of ascertaining that their expressed opinion is unbiased?—I wish to say that by churchmen I mean men belonging to all Churches—I did not refer to any Church in particular.

18210. Is it not the fact that the Roman Catholics, headed by their clergy, or guided by their clergy, have



demanded denominational education?—They have demanded it, but they seem to take the non-sectarian system freely enough for all that.

18211. Do they?—Yes, I find in the Belfast model school, even with the correction I just now spoke of, that were during the last quarter of the year 1856, 330 Roman Catholic pupils out of a total of 1,455 attending that school.

18212. Are you aware if you were to go to other parts of Ireland you would find not a single Roman Catholic child in the model schools?—I am quite certain of that.

18213. Therefore you are aware that that is not a fair specimen of the way in which Roman Catholics submit to the advice of their clergy?—I give it not as a specimen of the way in which they submit to their clergy, but as a specimen of the way in which they refuse to submit to them in particular cases.

18214. There may be special reasons in the case of particular schools; for example, the MacBorough-street schools have a mixed attendance, because we are told the Cardinal has not ordered the children to withdraw; but it would be very wrong to quote them as an instance of the Roman Catholic population preferring the non-denominational system?—In the Belfast schools the children were expressly ordered to withdraw, and two Roman Catholic clergymen attended that school from day to day, and by express orders from the Board had permission to copy the whole of the names and addresses of the Roman Catholic children, yet very many of the Roman Catholic pupils continued to attend.

18215. When you gave those numbers of children attending Belfast schools, do you mean to say that those are the number actually in attendance at the school, or only the number on the roll?—It was the number on the roll, but it is the rule of the Board that a child who has not been in attendance during the quarter is struck off the roll.

18216. But if a child attended even for an hour, and found it was a school different from what he wanted, and went out again, would not that one hour's attendance be sufficient to keep him on the roll for the quarter?—Yes, he would be kept on the roll.

18217. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are not the school-fee to the Belfast school paid in advance?—They are.

18218. Then suppose a child had paid the fee, would he be likely to lose the benefit of them by coming to attend during the quarter?—They might do so if they were ordered by their clergy to go elsewhere, especially if a gratuitous education were given to them in another place.

18219. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Do you think the Roman Catholic people, who constitute such an enormous majority in this country, are not generally, under the guidance of the clergy, anxious for, and that they do not demand denominational education?—There are two words there which appear to me to be inconsistent—one is that they are anxious for denominational education—one is that they are anxious for it, the other is that they are under the guidance of their clergy. Under the guidance of their clergy undoubtedly they have demanded it, but as to anxiety, in my opinion there is no anxiety at all, except in many instances an anxiety to please their clergy.

18220. Is it not the fact that every candidate for Parliament, either in Ireland or England, who has appealed to Roman Catholics for their votes, has put forward denominational education as one of the things he is prepared to demand?—I am not aware of it, but from your question I presume the fact is so.

18221. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Has your attention been drawn to the addresses of two of the candidates for the city of Dublin, one of whom was successful, and the other defeated, and who both expressed their adhesion to the mixed system?—No; for a man of my age and position I pay singularly little attention to what is going on in politics.

18222. And that the other candidates thought it best not to give any explanation of what they meant

by "freedom" of education?—I know nothing upon the subject.

18223. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—To come back to the main point. Do you think in laying down a plan, according to which the funds granted by Parliament for the education of the poor of this country should be distributed, the plan should be according to the wishes of the majority or not?—It must be in accordance with the wishes of the majority; and if the wishes of the majority are wise it ought to be, but if foolish it ought not to be.

18224. Who is to decide?—The majority.

18225. Mr. Stoker.—Do you approve or disapprove of the distinction between vested and non-vested schools?—I utterly disapprove of it.

18226. Would you desire the Board to withdraw aid from non-vested schools?—I would, immediately.

18227. Would you withdraw aid from schools taught by nuns and brothers?—Yes, and from all other schools taught by clergymen of any Church.

18228. What number of children would you then have left under education in primary schools in Ireland?—I cannot say.

18229. Is that a matter of indifference?—No; it is a matter of very great importance, but it is a thing I have no means of telling.

18230. You have referred to the scheme of the Board having contemplated from the first the formation of model schools: do you recollect in the estimate published in their second report, what sum of money each model school was to cost on the average?—I have no recollection.

18231. You do not remember that it was something under £730?—No, I do not remember.

18232. Do you think a school estimated to cost £730 could resemble any of the district model schools, as actually erected?—None that I know of.

18233. Do you know what period of time pupil teachers spent in the model schools which were to be established by the Board—the district model schools?—No.

18234. Was it not six months?—I cannot tell.

18235. Did not pupil teachers, after passing six months in the district model schools, come up to Dublin to be trained?—I have no doubt many of them did.

18236. Was it not part of the course prescribed by the Board that they should do so?—It is not in any of the rules.

18237. Mr. Sedgewick.—I think you said cleanliness, order, and morality were matters of vital importance to schools, in your estimation?—I know they are matters of vital importance, and if I had been asked the question, I am sure I should have said so; but I do not recollect mentioning the word morality. Cleanliness, order, habits of decorum and propriety were the things I spoke of.

18238. Do you think they are matters on which the parents of the children are very anxious?—I think that in general the parents of the children in the schools with which I am connected took very little notice of those matters when the children came first. They were very indifferent to them, indeed, and rather looked upon them as bothersome, and complained loudly when a child coming dirty to school was washed or obliged to comb her hair, or something of that kind, but after being at the school for six months, and seeing the improvement effected in the appearance of the children, I believe they all gave in that it was a right good thing, and were very glad it was done.

18239. Do you think morality one of those matters the parents should look to?—I am sure of it.

18240. Do you think they would be justified in removing their children from a school where morality was not taught?—From a school where immorality was permitted or countenanced they certainly would, but I think it must depend very much on circumstances whether direct lessons can be given on morality or not.

18241. Do you think it an important matter for the patron to see to—do you think if a patron does not attend to it he does not fulfil his duty?—I am sure of it.

18242. Do you happen to know the model school at

Nov. 26, 1859.

The Rev.  
John Scott  
Porter.

No. 25, 1868  
The Rev.  
John Scott  
Porter.

Larne, which you said was quite sufficient for the locality?—I did not say anything on the subject; I quoted an extract from the report of the District Inspector, in which he said that the schools in Larne were quite sufficient for the wants of the district; but he did not mention the model school, neither did I.

18253. Do you know Larne?—I know it well.

18254. Do you know the school called the model school there?—I do.

18255. Is it in the hands of trustees?—It is in the hands of trustees, of whom my brother is one.

18256. Have these trustees ever on any occasion whatever elected a Roman Catholic as a member of their body?—I cannot say, indeed.

18257. Do you happen to know anything of the school itself, or the manner in which it is kept?—I have been in it repeatedly and always was greatly pleased with what I saw. I may mention that one of my teachers in the Stanhope-street school was a mistress in the Larne model school before she came to me, and I am satisfied she was in very good training, and that she was a thoroughly competent teacher from what I know of her now.

18258. Do you think the people of a district would be justified in removing children from a school in which the officers were kept in a condition that would have disgraced the worst hack shop of any city in Europe, and in which the writing on the walls of the girls' place was worse than in any city or any part of the world I have ever seen?—If that applies to the condition of the model school at Larne, all I can say is such a thing never caught my eye.

18259. Suppose it did, would it not be a justification for removing the children?—Understandably. It would be a matter for the Inspector to interfere and have set right, and that would have been done immediately if the Inspector had seen anything of the kind; I am persuaded.

18260. Do you not think it is a part of the duty of the trustees and managers of a school to see to that, as well as the Inspector?—Understandably.

18261. Then you would think it a gross dereliction of duty that they did not see to it?—Clearly, if such a thing took place, of which I have no knowledge, nor the slightest suspicion. I never heard of it before, and find it difficult to believe that the facts have been correctly reported.

18262. When considerations take place with regard to the removal of children in particular localities, must not many things be taken into account beside

the mere fact of the wants of the locality?—have not the parents or the clergy of either denomination a right to look after such matters?—Suppose such things as you mention took place, I say the parents would be unjustifiable if they allowed their children to continue to attend there, unless redress were refused.

18263. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Keeping in view the places to which Mr. Sullivan has referred, do you think that such a state of things applies only to model schools?—I have already stated I find it difficult to believe that it applies even to one of them. I am quite sure it does not apply to the model school at Belfast, with which I am most familiar, or to the model school at Marlborough-street, so far as I have had an opportunity of seeing them. I have seen no dirt or writing on the walls of any kind, decent or indecent.

18264. Having regard to such places in different parts of the country, even at railway stations, are not writings seen on the walls occasionally very objectionable?—I suppose the best question refers to what may be called privy accommodations. I believe it is so. Unfortunately I have often seen such things and been disgusted with them. But, I must add, I do not understand the first question put to me to relate to such accommodations connected with the Larne model school, for as then I never was. I could not speak with reference to them at all. I was in the schools but did not go to these places.

18265. The Chairman.—Assuming it to be desirable to obtain increased local support for schools, would you see any objection to a local rate of limited amount?—I think it would be advantageous in calling the attention of the locality to the efficiency of the school, and moreover it would take off the appearance of an extraordinary education. I think both the appearance and the feeling of extraordinary aid ought to be taken away as much as possible from all educational establishments; in my opinion it is a very bad moral training for children to feel they are going to a charity school, whereas if there was a tax on the locality it would not be so much like it.

18266. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Are not almost all the children of this country educated on endowments?—I am sorry to say such is the case.

18267. Then can it be a degradation for the poor to receive aid from the State in the matter of education, when we are all receiving it—poor as well as rich?—No more in the former case than in the latter; in fact, not so much.

[Adjourned.]

#### FORTY-EIGHTH DAY, DUBLIN, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1868.

##### PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, K.P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLOMBROCK.  
WILLIAM BROOKER, Esq., M.C.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

REV. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, B.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASHOTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.  
LAURENCE WALSH, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } Secretaries.  
D. B. DUFFY, Esq., }

MR. CHARLES MATTHEWS SWORN and examined.

No. 26, 1868.

Mr. Charles  
Matthews.

18268. The Chairman.—Of what National school are you now a teacher?—Strabane parochial National school.

18269. To which religious body do you belong?—The Established Church.

18270. What is your classification?—First division of first class.

18271. How many years have you been a classified teacher?—About twenty-five.

18272. Have you been employed in many schools?—Yes. I have taught schools in different parts of the county. I have been teaching in the county of Antrim, the county of Down, the county of Tyrone, the King's county, the Queen's county. I think these are all. I am at present in the county of Tyrone, in Strabane.

18273. Have the schools of which you have been master contained much admixture of religious doctrine?

sessions of the people?—Well, some of the schools did contain a fair admixture. One school, I believe, contained pupils of the Protestant denomination also; but in all other schools I had a mixture.

18264. What are the numbers in your school at present?—I believe there are about seventy-five on the rolls at present. I was not aware that any returns would be required in that way, and I have not made up any returns, but I answer pretty near the thing.

18265. What are about the numbers of the denominations in your school?—At present I think there are on the rolls four or five—four, I think—Roman Catholics. There are about eight Dissenters. I think there are about twenty-six or twenty-eight Presbyterians, and the remainder belong to the Established Church.

18266. Have the schools in which you have been employed been all under the management of members of the Established Church?—No; I taught one school, the manager of which was a Presbyterian minister—two schools indeed. In the other cases the managers were members of the Established Church, lay or clerical—one lay manager, and a lay patron, Lord Ashburton. The Hon. Charles Trevelyan was the manager of the school.

18267. Are there any documents from the teachers which you wish to put in?—I have a statement here which I was entrusted to draw up by the teachers. They passed certain resolutions at a meeting in which they selected me to express their views, and in accordance with the resolutions passed there I drew up this statement, which I wish to read.

18268. Will you read it?—(Reads).—

My Lords and Gentlemen.—The National Teachers of Ulster desire to make the following statement of the grievances under which they suffer and to say that your Honorable Commission will carefully examine into each particular in detail, and that upon due cause being shown, you will recommend to Her Majesty's Government such remedies as may seem to your Honorable Commission appropriate and effective.

And, first, they have to complain that their present salaries are entirely disproportionate to their qualifications and the difficulty of their duties, that they are amenable to the inspection and responsibility of the services they render to the State, and that they are entitled to the liberality of the scale adopted in other departments of the Civil Service of a similar low significant and vital nature than that of Education.

—A third class teacher with qualifications equal, if not superior to those of certain other civil officers, receives on the average scarcely one-fifth the salary, while the increase of a first class teacher whose statements would bear in credible comparison with those of many a functionary in the receipt of £400 or £500 a year, seldom exceeds that of a porter or messenger who is only required to be able to read, write, and work the four common rules of arithmetic.—Further, the primary teachers of the sister kingdoms are much better paid by their work, their salaries being on an average, perhaps, three times the Irish teachers', and yet we hear them complaining, what, therefore, must be the feelings of the latter, your Honorable Commission will be able to judge.

Second.—To make matters worse, a portion of the twenty salary allowed to National teachers is sometimes withheld in consequence of a deficiency in the average attendance of their schools, when the circumstances are in no way to be traced to any fault of theirs. In the majority of cases where the average falls off, it is due to the fact that it is attributed to the Board's having established too many schools, or to some local circumstances under which the teachers have as control. Indeed many of the teachers complain that the very existence of the rule has a tendency to diminish the average, for they are obliged to allow less, for they say, that when the larger schools of the people come to be undertaken, they refuse to send their children to school, except upon the condition that they are to be taught free, and even supplied with books and stationery. The true way to keep up a sufficient attendance at each school is not to establish too many. Should a school be required, however, in a poor and sparsely populated district, surely the State and of the teacher of such a school ought not to be considered so as to add another to the list as well as at their own expense. The Ulster National Teachers would therefore most respectfully beg to request that their salaries from the State may be made to depend upon their qualifications and efficiency as teachers and not upon average attendance, and they would earnestly say that the Board's rule on the subject is exceedingly expeditious.

Third.—Your replies look upon the distribution of good service or supplemental salary as a liberal, generous and unjust, and intended to fret upon their character and efficiency as a body. Only about seven per cent of their numbers are in receipt of this salary, which was expressly designed "to encourage efficient and current teachers to labour steadily for the improvement of their schools." Being fully sensible of its utility in promoting the proposed end, as well as of its effect

in forming an inducement to teachers to continue in the service instead of leaving in numbers as at present, being also hourly alive to the depressing influence of the supposition that under the present practice, no attainment is attainable, the teachers of Ulster would pray your Honorable Commission to recommend that good service or supplemental salary be extended to all deserving teachers, and not confined as at present to a few of the most deserving.

Fourth.—That no fixed scale of retiring allowances has ever been promulgated by the National Board is regarded by the teachers as one of their greatest grievances. The Commissioners, indeed, state that they have the privilege of granting gratuities of reasonable amount to deserving teachers of long standing in their service, when, from old age and infirmity, they are obliged to retire, but only "in particular cases." The plan adopted for carrying this privilege into execution, appears to teachers too fatal and arbitrary. There is no fixed rule upon the subject. In some cases allowances are granted, always necessarily small indeed, and inadequate for their purpose, amounting at most to a year's pay for ten years' service, while in other cases there is nothing perfectly reasonable and no fixed rule of any weight. The teachers feel that there is nothing which they can look forward to with certainty, that there is nothing which they can claim as the garden of their service to their country, when after their years of toil in an ill-regulated and thankless situation, they have become through old age or infirmity incapacitated for the further discharge of their onerous duties. To remove this source of discontent, to inspire confidence, and promote the efficiency of the service, the teachers of Ulster would earnestly entreat your Honorable Commission, on the grounds of the services they render to the State, for the sake of the good effect it would have in inducing a worthy class of men to take charge of the schools, in the name of humanity and justice, to recommend that an equitable scheme of retiring allowances be forthwith sanctioned and carried into effect, as in other branches of the public service. They make the request with the more confidence, as the Inspectors of the clergy, the teachers of model schools, and others connected with the Department of Education, have already been placed on the Civil List.

Fifth.—The delay and consequent inconvenience and loss arising out of the present system may be imagined, receipting, and paying the amount of stipend due from the State, often prove very seriously upon men living on such small incomes as the National teachers, besides being injurious to their feelings, and casting an imputation on their character as men of trustworthiness and respectability. All correspondence relating to the payment of salary is addressed to the so-called managers of schools, and their necessities, through absence from home, sometimes through the pressing nature of their personal affairs, sometimes through sickness, or some other cause, are in numerous instances, the cause of great embarrassment and much unpleasantness. The teachers would, therefore, beg to request that all correspondence regarding the payment of salary, be directed to themselves, the District Inspector being a sufficient check, as, in fact, he is the only one, upon the regularity and accuracy of the returns. And they desire to declare that it would add very much to the respectability of their position, if the payment of their stipend were placed upon the same footing as in other departments of the Civil Service.

Sixth.—The teachers have never to be convinced that it is usually to the Government they must look for the necessary income to their salaries, and the means of support in old age. School patron and management generally contribute little or nothing to the support of their schools. Whatever they had been in the habit of giving is usually withdrawn, on getting their schools in connexion with the Board, or upon the promotion of the teacher in class; and it is to be observed that payments sometimes put forward as local aid to a school, are in reality given for Sunday services, which the teacher is obliged to perform as a condition of his appointment to the school, and indeed he is often obliged to perform these services without any remuneration whatever, as a work of charity, as he is told. At the same time, there is a very numerous class of teachers who wish to have a very cheap school to offer to the people, claim the right of presenting free pupils, and absolutely forbid the teacher to ask for fees in cases where the difficulties are very able to pay. Of the people themselves many are too poor to pay anything considerable, while others who have the ability will consent to pay only a mere trifle, being under the impression that the teacher is sufficiently provided for by the State. In the absence of a local tax for education, a severe very pecuniary rule on the subject as continued of the Government would, teachers in general are not at all grateful of any augmentation to their incomes from local sources. Some teachers would recommend that a certain sum be placed in the hands of the District Inspector to pay in the form of school fees for the education of very poor children in particular localities, depending upon the recommendation of the teacher and the regularity of the children's attendance.

Seventh.—As a proof of the expediency, and extensibility of the service it may be mentioned that it is impossible to induce responsible boys, such as the interests of society would require, to accept the position of schoolmaster with the reputation of becoming schoolmasters. Nay, even the poorest boys that become teachers hardly ever think of becoming teachers. After they have served a year or two they find themselves in possession of what is enough to enable them to go as apprentices to shoemakers, or take situations as clerks, and, of course, they leave. Nothing else could be expected when it is remembered that in the course of five or six years they are enabled to work up, with steadiness and honesty, to positions worth £20, £40, and £100 a year, and upwards.

5 K

Nov. 20, 1868.

Mr. Charles Matthews.

Nov. 25, 1896.

Mr. Charles  
Matthews

Young teachers are constantly leaving the schools for situations as assistant surveyors, clerks in various offices, excise officers, &c., in which their class men find no difficulty in passing the examinations, and on inquiry at the Constabulary Depot in Phoenix Park it would be found that some are even joining the police force. And what sort of men are offering to fill the vacancies? The statements of the inspectors as contained in their latest published reports may be consulted upon this point. In many cases females have to be put in charge of male schools and in general the class of men offering as possible substitutes are of the worst description. The best interests of the country must suffer severely from the deplorable state of things, and the teachers of Ulster would therefore be highly to make a few further suggestions for the consideration of your Honorable Commission, which they believe would, if carried into effect, be found beneficial in improving the tone and efficiency of the National schools, and greatly tend to promote the blessings which a well ordered system of popular education is calculated to confer.

They would desire to suggest—

First.—That no person be allowed to take charge of a National school who has not been previously examined and passed, or certificated by a competent Board of examiners. That no teacher be permitted to enter on the duties of teaching, so possible, as at present.

Second.—That in view of the increase of the salaries a somewhat higher scale of qualifications for the third class of teachers, than that at present in use be adopted, and that the programme for the first and second classes be extended by the addition of an ample course of history and literature with a knowledge of Latin or a modern language.

Third.—That some reasonable security of position be afforded to the National teachers. That the rule which gives to managers of schools the power of summarily dismissing teachers, and which is frequently exercised to a harsh and unjust manner, be either greatly modified or, if possible, wholly abolished.

Fourth.—That means be adopted for improving the school buildings which are in general, both in a physical and moral point of view, wholly unsuited to the purposes of education, and that in rural districts means be provided for teaching agriculture, practically as well as theoretically.

Fifth.—That a suitable residence for the teacher be provided in connection with every school, and wherever it is practicable, a good garden or a piece of ground attached.

Sixth.—That the necessary supply of maps, blackboards, and other educational apparatus be not in the school-room only, be kept by the State. Teachers in general are obliged at present to provide out of their scanty salaries not only these articles, but also to keep their school-rooms clean and in repair, and not a few are compelled even to pay the rent.

18268. How do you arrive at the conclusion that the salaries of English teachers are three times those of Irish?—Well, it has been put forward in magazines on the subject. We have a journal called the *Irish Teacher's Journal*, and it has been stated there, and I have seen extracts from English educational magazines stating that the average income of English teachers is from £90 to £100. The average income of Irish teachers is, I believe, only £35. Scotch teachers are also well paid, I believe as well as the English teachers, at least I have been informed so. I have not been able to investigate the matter very closely.

18270. How do you calculate the average in case of an Irish teacher—by dividing into three the incomes of the first, second, and third classes?—No; by adding the total amount paid by the Government to the total amount paid in school-fees and dividing by the number of teachers.

18271. Are you aware that in England there are a very large number of small parish schools that derive no assistance from the State?—Well, I believe in some cases there are; from the managers, perhaps, refusing to comply with the conscience clause, as it is called, or something of that sort.

18272. As in England it is the large schools that are for the most part under the Committee of Council, would not that make the rate of the scale naturally higher than in Ireland, where there is an immense number of small rural schools under the Board?—Yes, but from the system adopted in paying those large schools, that is, by what is called results, that system might work very well with big schools, but it would be of very little use to small schools, I think.

18273. Mr. Stokes.—In calculating the average payments to Irish teachers, do you include schoolmistresses as well as masters?—Well, I should think so.

18274. Are you aware that the average which you have given for the payments in England applies to the masters only?—No; I am not aware of that fact.

18275. The Chairman.—Have you any knowledge

of a memorial that was presented some time ago by teachers to the National Board, asking for an increase of salaries?—I have heard of such a memorial being presented by the teachers of Belfast. It was sent round to our neighbourhood for signature, and we put our names to the memorial, and forwarded it to the teachers of Belfast, and they asked for an opportunity of presenting it, by deputation, to the Commissioners of National Education, but they were refused.

18276. Are you aware of the answer which was returned to them from the Commissioners of Education?—Well, I think it was to the effect that they would not receive the deputation, and that if they thought they could better themselves, they might leave the service—something to that effect. That is my impression. The teachers are taking them at their word. They are very numerous leaving the service.

18277. Are you aware of the statements made in the answer which was sent to those teachers by the Commissioners, showing the considerable and repeated augmentations which had taken place in various years from the commencement of the system?—Well, I know that. I know that augmentations have been made, from my own personal knowledge, but I never saw the text of the answer to the Belfast teachers published. I know repeated augmentations have been made; but I do not think they are keeping pace with the cost of living in this country, and the general increase of wages in all trades and professions.

18278. The address which you have read speaks of the good service premiums being extended. Will you explain in what manner or in what degree you would contemplate extending them?—As I have stated here, I think every teacher who discharges his duties faithfully, and whose school is well reported on by his Inspector, after a certain number of years' service, should have good service pay extended to him. I have a scale here which I drew out.—That good service salary should commence after seven years. Of course the word good service implies that it should be paid to no man whose service has been bad, but, under the present position, it is paid only to a few, a very few, of the most deserving. The Board state that they have only got a certain sum to pay away in that way, and they are of course limited in their power to confer it. We would suggest that good service commence after seven years, and be increased by periodical increments till, after fifteen years, a man's salary should have been increased by a quarter's pay, or a fourth part of his class salary.

18279. It sometimes happens that the quarter's payment of the school is delayed for there being some accounts not adjusted between the school and the Board. Are the quarters' payments to the schools delayed when that is not the case?—The cause of delay arises from the circumsious way they have of paying the accounts. First, a set of queries is directed to the manager which he is required to fill up and sign, and which the teacher is obliged to sign. With these queries comes a receipt. It is to be signed and sent back. If the school has not been kept open during the full quarter, or if there is anything to be deducted from the teacher's salary on any account the receipt must be returned unsigned. Then a new receipt is sent back and signed, and then the amount is forwarded from the office; sometimes after very considerable delay, and very often the manager keeps the teacher waiting for weeks before he hands him over the post-office order.

18280. How long after the expiration of the quarter was the last payment made to you?—Well, I do not exactly know, but I think it must have been some five or six weeks. My manager is rather an exceptional case. I would not like to say anything that would reflect upon him. He is the Lord Bishop of Derry, and he continues to be manager of my school under peculiar circumstances, and he is often from home.

18281. Was the delay in the payment of your salary at the last quarter owing to his lordship's absence?—I think so.

18282. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware that

Nov 26, 1868  
Mr. Charles  
Matthews.

there are many managers who are absent from their sphere of duty, thereby involving delay in the payment of salary—does that apply to many managers?—Yes; I think so.

18283. The *Chairman*.—In what manner do you suggest that the payments may be simplified or expedited?—Well, there are two ways of doing it. As I have said here, the documents relating to payments might be forwarded direct to the teacher himself. The District Inspector would be a sufficient check on the accuracy of the returns he would make as to the length of time he had been in the school. Then the post-office order might be forwarded direct to the teacher himself. Otherwise the Inspector of the district, perhaps, might pay the salaries quarterly or monthly. Some teachers would like to be paid monthly, as in other departments of the Civil Service.

18284. Mr. *O'Brien*.—Would not the Inspector be often out of the way?—Oh, he is generally in the district, and he would have nothing to do but to appoint a day to pay the salary, and I have heard teachers say they would walk miles to get it from him. Sometimes they have to walk miles to their managers, and have to return the same distance without getting it from them.

18285. The *Chairman*.—Do I gather from that memorial that teachers in considerable numbers get better employment in other professions?—Presently, my lord. I have a list of instances here.

18286. Then do you consider that those employers esteem it a recommendation to a young man that he has been a trained teacher?—He is generally found to make a good clerk. The ordinary National schoolmaster, whether trained or not, is found to make a good clerk. He is a good accountant, and perhaps writes a good hand, and can spell well—even the lowest grade of teacher.

18287. Then so far does the being a trained teacher assist him in improving his situation in life?—I think many adopt the profession for that purpose, and make it a stepping-stone to something higher. I have known instances of it myself. For instance, when the revenue force of police were disbanded, I knew a policeman going to become a National schoolmaster, and going into a school, and working, until in the course of a year or two he got a situation as clerk of the Petty Sessions, and he is now enjoying a good income. Managers are not very particular sometimes in the sort of men they appoint to schools.

18288. Is it not in some degree an advantage to schools that masters after having taught a few years should obtain employment elsewhere, and give place to younger teachers?—I think it is a great injury to the cause of education that the schools should be constantly kept in the hands of men like those.

18289. Considering the large number of small schools in Ireland under the Board, are not these a class of schools that would be better taught by young men who are seeking advancement, than by persons of more advanced years?—I cannot at all agree to that, my lord. Sometimes those young men when they get a few hours, when they think the Inspector will not be in upon them, study for themselves; they read a little, and very often they get pupils to work some in arithmetic far on in the book, to practise themselves, when the pupil is losing his time, almost, attempting them.

18290. I think the memorial which you read proposed that an untrained teacher should be allowed to teach in a male school?—Well, I do not say altogether untrained. I think he should be found competent by examination. As far as I am concerned, I would admit them no matter from what place they came, provided they passed an examination as in other departments of the Civil Service, and were found duly qualified to take schools. It would be better, perhaps, that they should serve a time as monitors.

18291. Is not the money expended by the Inspector at his first visit after his taking possession of the school?—He may remain for months in the possession of the school without being examined by the Inspector. The

Board say it would save them a great deal of trouble if managers would present teachers for examination before they put them in charge of schools, but the managers do not comply with that request very frequently. Sometimes men who are incapable of conducting the situation after remaining for months in charge of the school have to be turned away.

18292. Why do you attach so much importance to the teacher being examined before he takes possession of the school, instead of being examined by the Inspector on his first visit afterwards?—Well, it prevents the possibility of incompetent men taking charge of the schools, and saves the time of the pupils, and saves the public funds. For instance, if a young man gets charge of a school, and remains in charge of it for five or six months before the Inspector comes, when the Inspector comes he is examined, and perhaps reported incompetent, and he has to be removed, and then, further, as Inspectors are very indulgent in that way (sometimes they do not like to quarrel with the managers), they retain them a further time on probation, and perhaps, after all, they have to be finally removed.

18293. After a teacher is reported, but unclassified, does he get his salary?—Yes; the Board pay him until they give him notice. They say they will give him one month's notice, until he has to finally leave.

18294. Then, if he is reported incompetent, does he get the lowest class salary?—That is called probationer's salary.

18295. Why do you suggest that no probationer should be allowed?—For the reasons I have already stated, my lord. It is a loss of the public money, and the time of the pupils at school, and it is this very class of men that are sometimes put into the schools. It lowers the tone of the service, and gives a bad name to the whole class of teachers in fact.

18296. What interest have managers in retaining incompetent teachers?—Sometimes they put a man into a school from his being a neighbour, and, perhaps, sometimes because they think it a charity; and, however laudable that sentiment may be, it is not for the good of the country, I think.

18297. Are there any ordinary schools under the Board, in which modern languages are taught?—I think very few at present; they attempted to teach it in some of the model schools, but the Commissioners, I believe, found fault with it.

18298. If, as your memorial suggests, a knowledge of modern languages were required for first or second class masters, would not that restrict the number of first and second class masters very much, and so be a very great handicap to them?—I think not, many of the National teachers at present do know Latin, and, perhaps, a little Greek too; and they would find it easy to learn French, I should think, if required. Then, as they get on to be second class teachers, and work up gradually through the divisions up to first division of first class, and get time enough, I think they would be able to acquire a competent knowledge of Latin and French, and that would improve their minds, and make them more beneficial as teachers, and in many ways.

18299. Setting aside the model schools, as how many of the ordinary parish schools under the National Board, do you think that there would be any pupils who would require to learn modern languages?—Well, I think pupils would like it. At my school there are a great number of boys preparing for mercantile situations, and French is generally considered a useful thing to mercantile men; and I have a class of six or seven boys in that school learning Latin.

18300. Are those children the class of persons for whom primary education is intended?—Well, they practically make use of it. I cannot exactly say for whom it was intended. I suppose it was intended for the very poor, but these people make use of it.

18301. And do they pay any school fees?—They do.

18302. Mr. *Dowse*.—What class of persons are those?—Shopkeepers' sons, and farmers' sons.

18303. The *Chairman*.—With respect to security

Nov 26, 1895.  
—  
Mr. Charles  
Matthews.

of position, is it not competent to any master, in making an engagement, to engage with the manager that he should give and receive three months' notice? —Yes, of course it is, when they enter into a contract of that sort, but managers are very little inclined to do so. In one case I had an agreement with a manager for three months' notice, and he attempted to put me out without any notice; I had to resist him. We had a lawsuit on the subject, and of course I defeated him; but he applied to the Board for the rule, and they sent him down in black and white that he had full power to dismiss me, and I wrote to the Board, also, and they sent me the same rule, but I thought that whatever the rules of the Board might be, they could not contravene the laws of the land, and I insisted on my three months' notice.

18304. Were you successful?—I was, my lord.

18305. Do you suppose that a master of known ability or experience would have difficulty in agreeing with managers that he should have a certain definite notice?—Well, if it were attempted it might be arranged. I do not wish to cast a reflection on managers in general. A great many of them are very kind, but there are others who do not agree to give any notice. They want to act I think in a very despotic manner.

18306. Is the profession of schoolmasters at present overstocked, or is there a difficulty in filling many of the schools?—There is very great difficulty in getting properly qualified teachers, and I heard a Head Inspector lately say that he never got a worse class of probationers offering than at present.

18307. Would not that increase the facility of masters obtaining agreements to have a certain notice?—Perhaps it would, but I am very much afraid that if a master were disposed to show any weakness the manager would not have him at all, or if he were supposed to be anything like an independent man.

18308. What further provision could there be besides that which I have suggested—to give your memorial terms security of possession?—Well, for the teachers I think it might be arranged very easily in this way. Suppose some office in Dublin was appointed for the purpose of keeping a register of candidates, those who wished to become teachers, and held periodical examinations, and got their names upon the roll; when the manager of a school wanted a teacher for his school he could easily apply at that office for a teacher. He could scarcely do so as an advertiser in the public prints, and he might describe the class of teacher he wanted—third-class teacher or second-class teacher, and with the qualifications of years or anything else he wanted, and specifying the religion if he chose. Then a man might be sent to that manager, and if he did not please the manager, the manager might say "This man does not suit me," and the Board, perhaps, having another vacancy, could put him into it, and remove him from one school into another—not throw him on the world entirely.

18309. Do you contemplate the schoolmaster being appointed by the Board, instead of being selected by the manager?—The manager would still, after the Board selected them, have a veto on the sort of teacher selected for him, and he could have been removed in the same way. A magistrate or a country gentleman can apply for a force of constabulary in his neighbourhood, and he can get them when required.

18310. Are there many cases, within your own knowledge, where masters are made to pay the rent of their school-houses?—Yes; I have known several cases. When I was teaching at Morville, before I went to Strabane, there was a schoolmaster paying £5 a year for rent. In the town where I now teach, Strabane, there is a very respectable man, Mr. McGowan, who has moved some rooms and purchased some houses, and he keeps the school-room in his own house, and he supplies a school to the neighbourhood, and is very badly treated in return for it. I have also a whole host by use of men who pay rent, and can give you numerous instances, if you so wish.

18311. Rev. Dr. H'gan.—Can you state the

number of cases, and within what districts?—I have got a list of five in the county of Donegal, seven in Tyrone; and I have got one in Fermanagh; and I am sure there are a great many other cases, which I have not been able to make out, but these being in my immediate neighbourhood I have got.

18312. The Chairman.—Will you read your list?—(Reads).—

Strabane, McGowan.—Rent, Reptin, &c.  
1. Miss Debray, Morville, £5; Crosskey female, £3; Tullymore, £2 10s.—Adrian schools. Ballybelly school pays £4 7s. 6d.; manager threatened to dismiss him for talking Inspector.

2. Tyrone.—Brough, Tullykeena, Bredanator, Carr school, repaired by Mr. Foster; previously rent free; owner of ground, and a member of committee, afterwards came to teacher to demand rent. Brough pays manager £2 12s. for "dirty hotel", Mr. Fadden, Drumaherry S. A., Castleberg, £4 12s. to manager.

3. Fermanagh.—Teacher of Drumaherry pays £3 10s.

18313. Do you consider that the circumstances of residences being provided for schoolmasters would add very much to their comfort?—I think it would. There are circumstances where men have to walk five or six miles of a morning, and very many instances in which they have to walk from two to three.

18314. Do you consider that the comfort and convenience of it would be above the mere money-value of the rent?—Well, not exactly comfort. I do not speak for the teacher alone, but for the good of the school. No doubt it would be a convenience to the master; but I am informed that masters are very often late in the morning, having to walk a long distance to the school; and children are kept tramping at the gate; and when they come into the school they are tramping with cold for a long time before the fire can be lighted.

18315. Mr. G'gan.—Are those teachers who pay the rent of the schools the actual tenants of the landlord of the school, in respect to the premises for which they pay the rent?—Of course it would appear so.

18316. I want to know whether they actually stand in the relation of tenant to the landlord of the premises?—Yes; they stand in the relation of tenants to the landlord.

18317. Then they cannot be turned out of the school except after notice to quit by them?—Well, as tenants, I suppose so; but if managers refuse to sign their documents, and get them their salary, they are obliged to go out.

18318. Do they pay rent to the landlord or to the patron of the school?—In some cases they pay to the manager of the school; in others to landlords who are not the patrons.

18319. Is the manager in such a case the landlord?—In one case I believe he is the actual owner of the premises.

18320. Can you particularise the case?—Well, I cannot go into the particulars of it. I have received a general statement.

18321. I do not want you to go into the particular tenancy, but the particular case in which the patron of the school is the landlord, and receives the rent from the teacher?—I have shown here that Ballybelly (5) schoolmaster pays £4 7s. 6d., and the manager threatened to dismiss him for telling the Inspector that he had to pay the rent. I have Brough (5) school here, the master of which pays to his manager £2 12s.

18322. Mr. Deane.—Have you got the names of all the parties?—Well, I do not like to name the names of the managers. I am not authorized to name them; but I believe I could find them out; and I have also an objection to give the names of teachers, because these teachers might be visited with very severe punishment.

18323. The Earl of Downshire.—Do you not give the name of each school?—Yes.

18324. Mr. Stoker.—In any of these cases do the teachers or members of their family carry on in the premises any other business, such as keeping a post-office or shop?—I am not aware of any instance of that sort.

Nov. 25, 1868.  
Mr. Charles  
Munroe.

18335 Rev Mr. Gosse.—Is there in any of these cases a dwelling-house as well as a school-room?—I am not aware of a dwelling being connected with the school-room either; I think it is for the school-room alone.

18336 Mr. Gilson.—You have mentioned that the salary would be reduced if the school fell below a certain amount of average attendance. Would you say, no matter what the number of children attending the school was, the teacher of the school should be paid the full amount of his class salary?—Yes; I think so.

18337 Do you not think that the rule of the Commissioners, fixing the number of 30 as the average attendance, in respect to which the teacher should receive his whole class salary, affords some reason to induce the teacher to be more vigilant in looking after his pupils and seeing that they attend regularly?—Well, it may have an effect in that way, but there are many cases in which the average has become reduced from the Board's establishing rival schools in the neighbourhood, and no exertions of the teacher could keep up the regular average.

18338 You are aware that no school can be established in which the average attendance is not thirty?—Oh, yes; they will establish schools for an average of fifteen.

18339 They did that one time during the famine years, but not since?—I think that is their present rule. I am not aware that the rule has been changed.

18340 You have stated that the salaries of teachers had been increased from time to time. I see that in 1850 the first division of first class male teachers had £35. I find that now the salary is £52. There is a difference there of £17. That is nearly 50 per cent. of an increase in that class. Do you consider that inadequate?—Well, it is a very good thing as far as it goes, but not many of the teachers have been able to avail themselves of it.

18341 Why have they not been able to avail themselves of it? Is not this promotion from one class to another open to every teacher who chooses to come forward to the periodical examinations of the Inspectors?—Yes it is, if they are conducting their schools properly.

18342 Is it not right that there should be an inducement to teachers to continue their studies, as to rise from one grade to another?—Most decidedly, I approve of it.

18343 What is the rate of increased payment that you would propose, in order to get rid of this complaint which you put forward?—Well, I think clearly that the teacher ought to be paid, if he is qualified.

18344 Let us suppose that they are all qualified?—I say that no teacher should be employed under the Board at a lower salary from the Board than £30 a year. No teacher should be admitted to a school but a classed teacher, and he should have, at least, £36.

18345 He has at present £18 in the second division of third class, and £24 in the first division of third class; you think that the first division of third class should be increased 50 per cent., £34 and £18 making £52?—Yes. I would have nothing but one division in the third class—the third class teachers.

18346 You would retain only the first division of third class, that is, the £34 a year and make it £52; that adds 50 per cent. to the stated salary of the first division, and it is 100 per cent. increase on the second?—I would give him £36. I think he ought to have it.

18347 The £18 man, supposing him to be qualified, you would raise up by 100 per cent?—Yes; I would require a properly qualified man and I would pay him for his work. A common labourer is able to earn £30 a year at present.

18348 Now take the second class. At present the first division of that has £32 and the second £28. I suppose you would have only one class there?—No, I would have two divisions in the second class, and I would make them £42 and £48 respectively.

18349 Now what per-centage of increase is that on each?—Well, the per-centage is not uniform throughout; because I would give the third class somewhat more.

18350 Please tell me what it is—at present the lowest division has £28 and you would make that £52?—It is just 50 per cent.

18351 Is the first class would you retain the first, second, and third classification?—No; first and second division only in first class. I think two divisions are quite enough.

18352 The second division has now £44—what would you make it?—I would make the second division £54 and the first division £60.

18353 Then your per-centages become smaller as you proceed?—Yes; I should like to try to raise the lower classes and to try to get better men into the service. I do not speak for myself, because I am pretty well off. My school is a good one. I have not much to complain of. My school is worth from £115 to £120 a year, and I do not think I am a bit too well paid. I should like to get more if I could.

18354 Is there not any advancement open to teachers in the appointments to model schools?—I think not. At present they are confining their appointments to those that are trained up about the model schools, the pupil teachers, and assistant teachers. I was nominated for a model school myself, and was passed over for a second-class teacher, when I was first of first.

18355 Are not model schools held by teachers trained under the Board, and therefore teachers trained under the Board may be masters of model schools?—Yes; that is where they are about model schools, and in model schools. I believe it is practically impossible for a teacher of an ordinary school to get a model school at the present day.

18356 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do teachers of model schools form a large class?—I think they are not a very numerous class of teachers. It is easy to calculate the number of model schools. They are very small compared with the teachers, in general, of Ireland.

18357 Mr. Gilson.—Is it not an advantage that a man has still promotion from the third division up to the first, and from the first division up to the model school—the model school salary is £50 at present, is it not?—I believe the head teacher's payment is £60, and goes up to £100.

18358 Is that not a very commendable object for a man's ambition?—But how many model schools are there in Ireland?

18359 Answer the question?—Oh, it is certainly an inducement to a teacher, but they cannot all aspire to it.

18360 But they have all a hope of it?—No, I think not.

18361 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—With regard to the teachers of ordinary schools, from your experience of them, do they cherish a hope of such appointments?—Very few of them; they think it is more the prize and favourites about the model schools that get the appointments, than ordinary teachers.

18362 Mr. Gilson.—Is it your complaint, or is it the statement, that the appointment to model schools is a matter of favour, and not of recognition of merit, on the part of the Commissioners?—I believe that persons in authority have a notion that if a teacher is not trained up about a model school, and has not learned the routine of it, they would have some trouble with him, and that those who are about, and in, model schools all their lives, make the best model school teachers.

18363 You have said that young men leave the service to be appointed clerks. Is it not quite possible that a very good clerk may have been a very bad teacher?—It is possible; a poor teacher might make a very good clerk.

18364 Are the qualities which would make a good teacher necessary for a good clerk in a merchant's office?—No, I think they diverge very widely.

Dec 26, 1884.  
Mr. Charles  
Matthews

18354. Might not a man in a school find teaching irksome, and be very glad to get into an office where he would have occasion only to use his pen?—He might.

18355. Do you think that any arrangement on the part of the Commissioners could prevent the effect of the competition of other occupations leading out to-dicament to men to leave the service of the Commissioners?—If they made the situation of schoolmaster as good as any other situation, I don't think they would leave it; teachers, in general, seem to be attached to it.

18357. Have you heard of the complaints of the smallness of the pay that exist in the Constabulary, and everywhere throughout the different departments in Ireland, so much so that the heads of the police find it difficult to induce young men to enter the police service?—But the teachers are going into the police, which proves that the police is more popular, had as it may be, but as young men think it, they are leaving the National schools to go into the Constabulary.

18358. There may be a variety of tastes. Some men might rather be policemen than schoolmasters?—But we find that some who have been first-class teachers are leaving schools and taking clerkships.

18359. You say that the Board has established too many schools in some places, and in consequence of that that the teachers are not able to sustain their average attendance?—Precisely.

18360. Now, what restraint would you put upon the discretion of the Commissioners with respect to that matter?—It would be easy to ascertain.

18361. I suppose the schoolmaster and the manager of a school would be rather unwilling that another school should be established within a certain proximity to his own?—Not if there are children enough to fill both schools.

18362. Do you think that the patron of one school already in connexion with the Board should be required to give his assent and approval to the establishment of another school in his neighbourhood before that other is received into connexion?—Well, his opinion might be taken about it. It is not necessary in every case that he should give his assent, because patrons perhaps object to other schools being near theirs.

18363. You have stated that the conditions on which the good service salary is held are a reflection on the character of the teacher. Would you explain?—They state that it is to encourage efficient teachers to labour zealously in their schools. Now, from the number of good service salaries that they award, it would appear that there are very few deserving teachers, when only seven per cent. of them receive that pay.

18364. The Chairman.—Does not that state, as you stated before, from the limited amount of the disposal of the Commissioners for that purpose?—Well, perhaps they would explain it so, and say that they have not it in their power to give any more.

18365. Mr. O'Brien.—Does not the good service salary depend on the length of time that they have been in the service?—But it begins at eight years, and there are a great many teachers in the service longer than eight years.

18366. And after eight years?—They increase it by periodical increments. They increase it again at twelve, and again at seventeen years.

18367. I think you say that you would have an annual increase of salary after the end of seven years?—Yes, I would give them an increase at seven years. They should get the next increase perhaps after twelve years' service. I have not marked it down on paper, but I should say after twelve years' service. And again after fifteen or sixteen years. The present rule is seventeen years.

18368. Then you would do away with the good service allowance altogether as a special thing, and make it a general rule?—To all deserving teachers. Those who did not conduct their schools efficiently, or

upon whom the Inspectors reported badly would not get it; but if they are giving good service, payments in other departments, the teachers should get good service pay if they conduct their schools efficiently and their moral character is unobjectionable.

18369. Do you think that the present rule of good service salary is not sufficiently increased, taking into consideration also the increase of classification and division, and the rise in the classification of the teachers?—Well, the scale I have proposed is just similar to the one adopted by the Board, a quarter's salary after seventeen years' service. They add a quarter's salary to the amount paid in each case.

18370. Are you aware that in the Civil Service there is no retiring allowance until after at least twenty years' service?—Yes, I believe so. I am not aware of the fact, but I know that after thirty years' service they are entitled to two-thirds of their pay in general. I am not aware that it was altered to twenty years.

18371. Do you consider now that you stand in the same relation to the State as the persons that are actually paid in the employment of the State, holding offices under, we will say, the Board of Irish Revenue?—I would have an ambition to be so indeed.

18372. The appointments are made by the patron?—By the patrons or managers.

18373. The manager has the power both of appointments and dismissal?—Yes.

18374. You are accountable to the manager for the way in which you discharge your duties as well as to the Board?—Yes, but the manager leaves it very much to the Inspector. The managers don't inquire very much how the schools are going on.

18375. You and you must look to Government only for an increase in your emoluments. Do you think that would promote a healthy state of things. Should not the parents be induced to pay a contribution for the instruction which their children receive from the schoolmaster?—In expressing that opinion, I reflect the sentiments of teachers in general. I think it has a very good effect to make children pay at school. I know that, as far as my own experience goes, I have been successful in making the people pay a great deal more than they have been in the habit of paying. A great many teachers say it is impossible. My managers in general left the matter to myself, and left me at liberty to do what I thought most beneficial for the school and the cause of education. I worked them up gradually until I have, in several cases, trebled, and perhaps quadrupled, the school fees received by my own predecessors. But all managers will not permit that.

18376. Do you not think the Commissioners, in the exercise of a wise discretion, should endeavor to bring about that state of things generally, which you brought in your school?—It might have a beneficial effect, but the teachers think it impracticable.

18377. Would not an indigent man prefer to be under a Government Board, and have a fixed salary, than to have his income depend upon his own exertions?—Perhaps it would be more satisfactory to him. I think an indigent man would rather have a fixed salary.

18378. Do you think the National Board should encourage such men?—No, but I maintain that if we got the salaries we demand, and had half as much added on from local sources, we would not be too well paid. If I were paid £150 a year, I don't think it would be too much for the service I render to the country. I see the good I do, and I see the situations held by others with the duties attached, and I think I would be giving better value for my money than they are giving for their money.

18379. Generally speaking, are parents throughout your district adding to the rate of payment?—In my own experience they are paying better than they did in former times.

18380. You referred to local taxation as being a domestic thing in order to add to the emoluments of teachers?—Yes.

18381. Have you considered that question fully?—



Well, I have not entered fully into it. In that case also I am reflecting the opinions of the majority of the teachers of my district by whom I was deputed to come up here. They say it would relieve them from quarrelling with their manager's opinions about school fees, and they say they would oblige those people to pay who are indisposed at present to do so; and they think that some of it would come out of the pockets of the landlords, perhaps.

18382. If local taxation were adopted, I presume you would not require school fees to be paid?—I believe that is their view.

18383. When in point of fact you think the whole education administration by the Board should be supported either by the State or by local taxation?—Or by local taxation.

18384. You further refer to the introduction of history and literature into the branches of elementary education in National schools. Are you aware there are peculiar difficulties in connexion with the teaching of history which make it a particularly difficult subject?—Yes; particularly English and Irish history; I am aware of that.

18385. Do your remarks extend to ancient history only?—To history in general. I think there might be a text book got; I think it would be very hard to devise it, but let the teachers study from any source they like, and let the examiners only put particular questions.

18386. Do you teach history in your school?—Yes, it is learned and taught in the school; and there are points might be avoided.

18387. Do you think teachers would prefer payment of their quarter salaries to come from the Inspectors rather than through the hands of patrons?—As far as I have heard I believe they would.

18388. Would that not impose a large amount of additional duty upon the Inspectors?—Oh, no, I think it would be very slight.

18389. Has not each Inspector about 100 schools in the district?—Teachers suppose that less inspection might do. They don't see the very great necessity of three examinations in the year—three testing examinations. Periodical or incidental visits they consider would answer for the purposes of the inspection system.

18390. Is there any real objection that ought to be entertained by faithful and diligent teachers to having visits from the Inspectors even more frequently than three times each year?—No reason whatever, but they think three examinations in the year useless. The object of Inspectors is merely to test the amount of knowledge imparted in the school. He never shows us how to teach. We get little assistance from him in that way. He merely comes to examine the children and not to give assistance to us. Two or perhaps once a year might be sufficient for the purpose.

18391. When the object entertained by the Inspector in the faithful discharge of his duty, what objection can there be to any number of visits from the Inspector, giving a greater amount of assistance to the pupils and the Board that the teacher is doing his duty?—None, whatever.

18392. Is it a general complaint that patrons take little interest in the progress of their schools, and pay few visits to them?—It is a general complaint.

18393. Are you aware in Scotland which you mentioned, that the teachers there generally, on a large number of them, are merely teachers in course of preparation for the Church of Scotland—many of them probationers of the Church, or students for the Church who leave teaching when qualified to enter college?—Well, it is possible that may be so. I have known instances—frequent instances of it to the north of Ireland, myself; but these young men are men of higher attainments than those who go into the National schools and prepare for clerkships or other situations. They would be better enabled to discharge the functions of teachers.

18394. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you heard that any of those who had been equally well remunerated for their services as others, have never gone into the

ministry but continued as teachers?—I don't know a single instance of that.

18395. Was your school visited on the 25th of June last by any of the Constabulary?—I can't say the day, but a sergeant of the Constabulary did visit my school and make a return.

18396. What is the name of it?—St. Michael's Parochial School [18730], Irish-street?—Yes; Irish-street. We have several aliases for the streets there, some call it Church-street.

18397. Is yours a mixed school?—Well, it is not a mixed school in proportion to the number of the respective parishes in St. Michael's; but still it's mixed.

18398. Do you know the maxims of the school on the day on which the police made the visit to it, as to the number of children of religious denominations attending it?—I don't recollect it precisely. If I knew such information was required I should have brought the returns.

18399. I see from this record concerning the school that there were present twenty-five children of the Established Church, three Roman Catholics, twenty Presbyterians, and eight of all other denominations?—I think these are about the numbers. I think that is pretty correct.

18400. With regard to the National schools of St. Michael's Constabulary district, should you say they are a fair specimen of mixed education?—They are generally looked upon as such. Mr. Mahony, one of our Inspectors, looked upon them as a fair sample of mixed schools.

18401. I see there are forty-one National schools returned on this sheet. A mistake is made with regard to one school, consisting that and calculating the number at forty, can you tell me are or were thirty-seven of these National schools out of the forty made at least mixed?—I have not visited the schools, but from observations I heard teachers making in our associations I think that is a correct statement.

18402. Now you have said that you believed the salaries of the teachers are not proportionate to their qualifications?—Precisely.

18403. On what do you base that statement?—I base it on the programme for the Civil Service examination, and on the importance of the relative duties I have adverted to it in the statement I read, that a first-class teacher, who is required to have a fair amount of scientific and literary knowledge, is not better paid than a porter, nor perhaps as well, who has only to be able to read and write, and have an idea of the elementary subjects of arithmetic.

18404. I see in the journal to which you referred a comparison instituted between the teachers of the country and the police force. Do you think the teachers discharge equally important duties as the members of the Constabulary?—Equally important—yes, and what are far more important duties. I think it is much better to pay schoolmasters than grooms.

18405. And what is the proportion in the rate of payment?—I believe a sub-constable, who is hardly required to be able to do more than scribble his name, gets £40 a year. The lowest class of policeman is better paid than the middle class teachers.

18406. I see you refer to certain officers, some of whom gradually ascend to the position of divisional officers, enjoying £150 a year. Do you contend the first-class teachers are equal to them in point of ability and information?—They may not have as much knowledge about distillations, but they are much better scholars.

18407. Is it a general complaint of teachers that there is a great deficiency in the attendance of children at schools and a consequent small rate of payment to themselves, owing to the number of schools in the different districts?—It is a very general opinion.

18408. Do you believe that to be well founded?—From my own personal knowledge, I believe it to be so. There is overlooked with schools, and yet there are a great many children walking about the streets—Arabs. I should say a mixed school would be very necessary there.

Nov. 26, 1890.  
Mr. Charles Matthews.

Nov. 26, 1878  
Mr Charles  
Mathews.

18409. In the statement you read you spoke of "so-called managers." Why do you make that statement?—They are called managers and they do not manage the schools. These returns they are supposed to fill up are hardly ever filled up by them. They are sent to the teachers. Managers are supposed to examine and check the books and they never do it. In my experience, they send the papers to the teachers and put their names to them, and think they have done great work.

18410. As a matter of fact, are managers in the habit of visiting the schools, or having the class rolls brought to their own houses to check the returns sent to the National Board Office?—I think, in my experience, they seldom checked them or asked to see them at all. A great many managers would not take the trouble to understand the school accounts.

18411. Does one man in a dozen check them?—I think not.

18412. Is that the general opinion of the teachers?—I believe it to be so.

18413. Does that apply to teachers of all denominations—and to schools under managers of different denominations?—I won't speak for them all. I have some experience of all sorts, and have heard various opinions expressed by teachers of particular denominations. There are some of them more reserved in their statements than others.

18414. You have referred to delay in the payment of teachers' salaries, even in cases where the managers are not absent from their own local sphere of duty, by reason of their keeping the orders in their pockets or in their houses for weeks without sending the teacher and giving it to him?—I have heard so. I have even heard cases of teachers being troubled when they went to ask for their money—being kept standing in the hall, and afterwards sent away without getting it.

18415. In what way do you propose to limit the power of managers? What would you do on that point?—I have already expressed my opinion upon that point, of the method of appointing and removing teachers; but some other plan might be devised, if it was nothing better than making it imperative to give notice of some sort or other.

18416. Is the statement you made to us—are you the representative of the teachers of your entire district?—Yes.

18417. The Province of Ulster?—I am. They selected me at a congress or conference of teachers in Omagh to come here to represent them. All the teachers in that province, I believe, are represented except Belfast.

18418. Are those teachers belonging to the different denominations of the country?—They are.

18419. Do you think they concur with you in the expression of opinion which you have given to-day generally?—They expressed that opinion in resolutions which were carried unanimously.

18420. What means had they of knowing the views which you would express before this Commission?—They passed certain resolutions, on which I was to draw up and found my statement; and, on my oath, I think I have reflected them pretty clearly and accurately.

18421. Now do the teachers generally complain of the reluctance they occupy towards the managers of schools?—They have been getting more reserved upon that head within the past fortnight.

18422. Who have been?—Some of the teachers.

18423. What do you mean by that statement?—I mean teachers of a particular religious persuasion. I don't wish to enter into particulars; but I believe they have startled themselves by an act. They had a public meeting here in Dublin, at which a resolution was publicly proposed, stating that the power of the managers should be curtailed. They expressed it so in their local associations, and now some of them don't wish to say a word that would reflect in any way on the managers.

18424. What class of teachers do you refer to?—The Roman Catholic teachers.

18425. Do you mean to say that within the past fortnight they have receded from the position they previously took on that subject?—I do.

18426. I think in your statement you also mentioned the word "drudge," that teachers complained of being a drudge to managers, so that the fact?—It is; some of them are called on to hold Sunday schools, and teach catechism, and other things that should not be their duty, in my opinion, to do, and they look upon it as an imposition themselves.

18427. Now, do they complain of other Sabbath services which they are asked to discharge?—Well, I have heard teachers complain of it, I have heard of a teacher, who is a very wealthy and respectable man, who goes to a good deal of expense in keeping up his school for the neighbourhood, being asked to teach catechism on Sunday, and he being a blunt sort of man said he did not think it was his business, that he was not paid for it; he was then asked to do it as a work of charity, but he still demurred, and his manager told him that he believed he would sweep a certain house for a penny if he were paid for it.

18428. Have you heard, or known yourself, of many managers requiring the teachers to perform duties not connected with the school?—Well, except in matters of religious instruction, or playing music on Sunday.

18429. That is the class of grievances to which you refer?—Yes—and I recollect an instance myself where a teacher was obliged to act as leader on particular occasions.

18430. You have also referred in your statement to the power which these managers have frequently exercised in a harsh and unjust manner, and the teachers demanding the abolition of it—do the teachers you represent continue to demand the abolition of that power?—Well, not all the teachers, I have mentioned a class of teachers who do not wish to say anything that would interfere with the managers in any way. I have a list of cases where that power was exercised in a very cruel way, and led to bad results, too.

18431. Have you ever heard of the rules of the Board being infringed, owing to the mode of religious instruction given in the National schools from time to time?—Well, I heard of one case, but I cannot substantiate it. I heard of teachers, previous to confirmation, being required to teach catechism all day.

18432. In the National schools?—In the National schools.

18433. Do the teachers themselves regard that as an infringement of the rules of the National Board?—Of course they do, but under the circumstances they could not help it, and they were bound to obey; they did not report the case to the Inspector or the Board.

18434. Do you mean to say that any teachers refused to make a complaint in the proper quarter?—I think there are a great many who would not do it. I would not set so; I would regard an infringement of the Board's rules as far as I could.

18435. Is it your experience that managers of any denomination can be said to give religious instruction in these schools to children even of their own denomination?—Not in my experience. I have had experience of that sort in the case of the Bishop of Derry, who is still the manager of my school. When he was rector, and at home, he used to call regularly once a week to examine the children in Scripture, and send his curate on Saturdays to catechise the children of the Established Church; but the present minister never looks into the school—I believe on conscientious grounds—he is a Church Education man.

18436. What is the opinion of the teachers as to the amount of religious instruction given by managers in schools?—I think the pretty general opinion is that they give no religious instruction; that duty is pretty much shovelled over on the shoulders of the teachers.

18437. You have referred to teachers being incompetent and unqualified, and yet getting employment under the National Board, is that to any great extent?

—I believe there are very numerous instances of it. The Board's Inspectors in their reports make reference of the numbers that are to be dismissed for incompetency.

18438. In addition to what you have already said, can you suggest any steps by which to raise the general tone and elevate the status of the teachers of the country?—I have mentioned some; to raise their salaries, and prevent teachers getting change of schools without being duly qualified. I would raise the standard of examination for teachers, and give them several things that would improve their position in society, and thus give more weight to their teaching.

18439. You referred to good service salary, do you think the good service salary should be allowed to a certain number of teachers in any district, irrespective of the number of qualified candidates in that district?—I have already said that a good service salary should be paid to all deserving men, irrespective of district or anything else.

18440. Have you ever known deserving men, owing to some trivial point complained of, perhaps years previously, being deprived of that good service salary?—I have; I have heard teachers express an opinion that they had been very unjustly treated by being passed over.

18441. You have already given an opinion that the payment of teachers should not be liable to reduction, because of the decrease of the population in the various neighbourhoods. Does much reduction often take place owing to that cause?—Some teachers complain that the attendance at the schools has been diminished through emigration and the depopulation of the districts in various ways.

18442. With an undue multiplication of schools, of which you have spoken, a considerable reduction in the school fees has taken place, I suppose?—Of course.

18443. But, in addition, have you known teachers sustain a loss by the withdrawal of this good service salary?—I do not recollect an instance.

18444. Have you ever heard of a case?—I knew a teacher in Strabane who was on the point of it; through the action of the Christian Brothers' schools, his attendance was very much reduced. I believe the Head Inspector was sent to visit his school, but by a very great struggle and extraordinary vigour he was able to work up his school to the number required. If the attendance goes under 50, the good service salary is liable to be withdrawn.

18445. What is the opinion of the teachers as to promotion—whether it should depend on the power of the Local Inspector or the Head Inspector, or, as at present, be direct from the office?—Well, I think it's the general opinion that there should be a uniform standard of examination. Men's minds are so variously constituted that they are apt to take very different views of answers to the same questions as to relative merit, and the person whom one Inspector might think a clever and efficient man another Inspector might not think so clever or deserving. I should think there ought to be an examination board, perhaps, similar to the Board of Examiners of the Science and Arts Department, London, and that periodical examinations should be held by papers alone, and that these should be forwarded to the central body and decided there by a uniform standard; and that the efficiency of the school should be taken from the report of the District Inspector.

18446. From your experience of the country, do you think the parents of children could pay a larger amount of school-fees than they do pay?—I think they could. I see they are able to pay for other things. People can raise money for presentations and other things when they think proper, but they won't pay for the schoolmaster, and for that reason a great many of the teachers suggest that the local rate should be struck, and compel the landlord to pay.

18447. Do you think that if that was done that it would have a beneficial effect on the schools?—If the teachers and managers made a firm stand, the amount might be increased.

18448. Has this matter of school fees engaged the attention of the teachers you represent?—I have heard various conversations about it. Some maintain that the people are too poor to pay anything, and they don't like to hear of it.

18449. With regard to a question put to you, I have now to ask is it your opinion the Commissioners of National Education have ever taken any steps in order to increase the payment by school-fees to the teachers?—They laid down a rule that every child should pay at least sixpence a quarter, but never took the trouble to see that rule carried out. In the case of a school where the master has an average attendance of 45, he received only £1 4s 6d in four years. His manager won't allow him to ask fees. If the managers pulled together with the teachers, the amount of school-fees might be largely increased. A great many sensible teachers are of opinion that the people are able enough if they were willing.

18450. Why don't the managers co-operate with the teachers?—I have already stated that some managers find it their interest in various ways to say they are able to give the people a cheap education.

18451. Specify some of those?—An agent might say to his tenants that they supported a school for them, and a clergyman, for instance, if he were looking for a stipend, might say to the people, "We give you a cheap school, and its little enough you pay as well."

18452. You think that managers in many instances look after their own interest first?—Well, its natural to do so.

18453. Master Brooke.—You said that £36 a year was the lowest sum a schoolmaster should take, because that was the rate of wages. Do your labouring men about Strabane earn £36 a year?—I believe they are earning from 14s. to 16s. a week—ordinary labourers.

18454. Is that the common wages for common labourers in Strabane?—Well, I can't say that; but I believe good labourers could get that in constant employment. I don't suppose agricultural labourers get that. I mean labourers about towns.

18455. About the trades?—About distilleries and factories, and places of that sort.

18456. You said the present Bishop of Derry was once your rector?—Yes.

18457. And during that time yours was the parish school?—Yes.

18458. Who is the present rector?—The Rev. Mervyn Wilson.

18459. And he does not visit you?—No.

18460. Who is your manager?—The Bishop of Derry continues to manage the school, and I believe he is trying to get another appointment for me, to leave the school to the present rector to dispose of as he thinks proper.

18461. He does whatever a manager has to do in the way of forwarding returns?—Yes.

18462. But does not visit your school now?—He does not; it would be impossible to expect it.

18463. And virtually there is no control whatever, as the manager is away?—None.

18464. Rev. Mr. Cowe.—I want to see if I have succeeded in getting a complete summary of your views. Am I right in supposing that the teachers of National schools demand more salary—that it should be paid to them directly—that they should get their salaries without regard to the number of children they teach—that managers should have less power to remove them—that teachers should have residences, with land attached to them, if possible, and that they should be placed under the Superannuation Act, so as to have pensions on civil servants of the State?—Yes, that is quite correct.

18465. Is that all?—Well, there are other points about supplying the school with apparatus, keeping them in repair, and about abolishing rents where they exist.

18466. Keeping the schools in repair would only be a relief to managers, because the manager is *provis* face the person who is considered to pay for the school.

Nov. 26, 1868.  
Mr Charles  
Matthews

Is the teacher the person who does it practically?—I had several instances of it myself. On leaving my school at Moville, although it was a school vested in the Board, I had to leave £5 worth of apparatus there. They told me I could not remove it away, and the manager would not give me anything for it.

18467. Mr. Gibson.—Who paid for it in the first instance?—I did, I paid for it out of my own pocket in the usual way, at half-price. It was partly the Board's property and partly mine.

18468. Who is nominally the applicant for that supplying of that apparatus from the Board?—Of course the manager has to sign the order.

18469. You supplied the manager with money, and he applied and got the particulars?—I gave a post-office order myself to the Commissioners, but the application was made by the manager. The manager, in all such cases, has to sign the requisition.

18470. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—The money was provided by you?—Yes.

18471. Mr. Gibson.—Was that fact ever brought before any of the Board?—I don't think it was ever brought before the Board. I did not wish to trouble them about it. I spoke to the Inspector about it.

18472. Mr. Swinney.—What was the value of the apparatus?—I asked only £5 for it.

18473. Did you pay the £5?—I paid £5.

18474. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Give the name of the Inspector you complained to?—Mr. Graham. He is at present in Fonthlington.

18475. How long is it since this transaction?—I think it is seven or eight years ago since it occurred.

18476. Mr. Stokes.—How many years have you been teaching under the National Board?—Twenty-five years.

18477. How long have you been obliged to seek the aid of those crutches which I am sorry to see you use?—I believe I was reduced to that state at a very early age.

18478. Did that salary befal you before you went to the service of the Board?—It did, and perhaps had it not been for that, I would have looked out for some more active employment.

18479. What is your income from that school from all sources?—From £115 to £130.

18480. How much do you receive from the Board?—£25, the surplus being an allowance for extra branches—drawing, singing, and sometimes for training masters.

18481. What is the total?—From £115 to £130.

18482. What is the total from the Board?—About £75.

18483. How many days in the week do you teach?—Six days.

18484. How many hours daily?—I am employed in the school from ten o'clock till four o'clock; but I have to do various matters connected with it at other hours, and on an average I am sure I am employed in the work of the school for at least eight hours daily.

18485. How many hours do you devote to secular instruction?—Five and a half hours.

18486. How many hours do you give to it on Saturdays?—No time.

18487. How much time for religious instruction?—Half an hour on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and from ten to twelve on Saturday.

18488. What payment do you receive for giving religious instruction?—None. There is a foundation for the school. It was left to aid the education of the people of Strabane, but I am not aware that it was left for promoting religious instruction.

18489. As you receive already £75 from the State for teaching secular subjects, and as besides those subjects you give a certain amount of time daily to religious instruction, do you not think that any remuneration of salary to which you are entitled should come from those whom you serve by religious teaching, rather than from the State, which pays you already £75 for secular instruction?—If the teacher is obliged to give religious instruction, he ought to be paid for it. I think he ought to be relieved from

it. I think that men engaged in the subject of secular instruction can hardly bring to bear that earnestness of mind and seriousness of demeanour necessary for religious instruction.

18490. What vacation have you in the year?—I have eight or ten days at Easter. My present manager is so indulgent as to give me four weeks in summer when I ask it, and eight or ten days at Christmas.

18491. Are there any National schools in Strabane under Roman Catholic teachers?—There are two.

18492. You have, I think, three Roman Catholics attending your school?—There were three at the date mentioned there.

18493. Have you now more or fewer?—Four at present on the rolls.

18494. Do those children belong to one family, or more than one?—They belong to four different families.

18495. Is there anything peculiar about their cases which induces their parents to send them to your school rather than to schools under Roman Catholic teachers?—I think not. They live in the neighbourhood. I would have a great many occasionally, but they are pretty well watched. As soon as it is known they are coming to the school they are removed through some influence or other.

18496. To what class in life do they belong?—One is the child of a public-house keeper, two others are the children of labourers, and one is a young man who is preparing for a clerkship. He came to me for a short time to get a finishing touch.

18497. Are any of them the offspring of mixed marriages, or are both the parents of these children Roman Catholics?—Yes, I believe the latter.

18498. Do the children live at home with their parents?—They do.

18499. Mr. Deane.—The first rule of the Board states that the object of the National system is to afford a combined literary and moral, and separate religious instruction to children of all persuasions in their schools. I wish to have your opinion as to how that object of the Commissioners of National Education is to be carried out in their schools if the teachers are not to give religious instruction?—Well, I believe it is the opinion of teachers in general that the managers, when they are deacons, should give the religious instruction themselves, or that they should provide substitutes for themselves; and where there are lay managers, facilities should be afforded to deacons to attend and give religious instruction to the children of their respective denominations.

18500. You have four Roman Catholic children attending your school at present?—Yes.

18501. Have you ever known a Roman Catholic priest come into your school to give religious instruction to those children?—No; he never comes into the school at all.

18502. Are you aware whether he would be allowed to come into the school if he wished to do so?—He would be allowed to come into the school, but I am not aware, it being a non-vested school, whether he would be permitted to give religious instruction. I believe the plain fact is, that the manager has the power of limiting religious instruction, and excluding him if he thinks proper.

18503. As a matter of fact, are you aware whether the Roman Catholic priest, if he wished to come in and give religious instruction, would be admitted by your manager?—I can't say.

18504. Are the grievances that have arisen out of the action of managers towards teachers in their schools generally in the case of lay or clerical managers?—Do you mean the case of hardship towards teachers?

18505. Yes?—Well, I have heard of one or two head agents being very tyrannical and arbitrary in their way, but I have also heard the same thing of a good many deacons.

18506. Had you any teachers from the county Fermanagh attending the congress of teachers to which you alluded?—We had three teachers from Enniskillen.

Nov. 28, 1862.  
—  
Mr. Charles  
Matthews.

18507. Had you any from country districts?—We had from the country districts of Tyrone, Sligo, Fermanagh, Beragh, and the country about there.

18508. Is any case from the county Fermanagh of hardship on the part of a lay manager included in the list you brought before the Commission to-day?—No.

18509. Mr. Sullivan.—State again what grounds you have for saying that the lay teacher is unfitted to give religious instruction?—I can only speak from personal experience. I do not know particular men's sentiments on the question, but I think in order to make religious teaching effective, it should be done in a proper spirit. I do not think from the habits of teachers, and the routine they fall into, that they are well qualified to undertake the duty of religious instruction. They begin very soon to teach it pretty much like any other lesson, and teach it for teaching's sake alone, without making religious impressions on the children.

18510. Then you think lay teachers would not have a proper spirit in imparting religious instruction?—Well, I should think so.

18511. Now, in the cases of parishes, where there are a great many schools, and where there are but few priests, how do you think religious instruction could be given by these priests?—They could assemble them on Saturday in one house and instruct them, or they might employ some pious person in the parish.

18512. How far do you think a child of eight or nine years old ought to be expected to travel for religious instruction?—Well, all that are able to go to the Roman Catholic Church on Sunday, ought to be able to go to a place appointed for giving them religious instruction, and teaching young children that that would, I think, be useless.

18513. Would you think five or six miles would be a proper distance to take a child of that age during winter?—Well, I cannot conceive that there are many parishes so large as that they would be five or six miles to a central point in all directions.

18514. You do not consider being a schoolmaster incompatible with being a pious person?—No, indeed; I think many schoolmasters are very pious.

18515. In districts of the kind I allude to, who are the parties who could be appointed by, say the Roman Catholic priest to act as his deputies?—I think he ought to be the best judge of that himself.

18516. Just so; he considers he is the best judge, and selects the teacher?—He makes the teacher do it against the teacher's will sometimes.

18517. Suppose he did not compel the teacher, but was obliged to select somebody else in a parish where he had nobody else, what would be the result?—My position is, that the clergy are themselves the best qualified persons, and I think they could find time enough. Clergymen in general complain that they are very hard worked, but I think their work is very easy.

18518. Who are the teachers employed by?—The managers appoint them, and the State pays them in general.

18519. If they are employed by the manager, can he not dictate to them what they are to teach?—Under present circumstances he can; I am sorry to say, he exercises his power of dictation in rather an arbitrary way sometimes.

18520. Was that power of the manager to compel the teacher to give religious instruction one of the points discussed at the meeting to which you have alluded?—No; I am only speaking my own personal opinion now.

18521. Did it come before you?—No; we avoided anything referring to religion, but the teachers generally agree so far as this, that they ought not to be called upon to give religious instruction without being properly remunerated for it.

18522. Then, if they were remunerated, would they undertake the duty?—Well, perhaps some of them would, but for my own part I would prefer not having anything to do with it.

18523. Then it is the want of remuneration rather than unfitness they object to?—I have told you I consider from my own experience of the matter, and from watching other teachers sometimes, that they are not fit persons for giving religious instruction.

18524. Do you know generally any country where the teacher is free from that duty?—In America they are not required to give religious instruction.

18525. Are you aware how the case is in England?—I believe they have the denominational system in England.

18526. In Prussia how is it?—I think the clergyman makes use of the teacher there too.

18527. What is the case in France?—I don't know, but I think we are a peculiarly situated people in Ireland, and I think it would be better if the teacher gave no religious instruction.

18528. On what ground? why is it we are so peculiarly situated in Ireland?—Well, we are very much split up in Ireland with regard to religious opinions, and I am sorry to say it is the cause of many an evil thing in the country.

18529. Do you mean to say a Presbyterian teacher, a Roman Catholic teacher, or a teacher of the Established Church, could not give religious instruction to children of his own creed?—If you want mixed education, I think it would be better that the teacher gave no religious instruction.

18530. Your objection then arises from the fact of the schools being mixed?—Yes, partly, and partly from the teacher not being a qualified religious instructor.

18531. The Chairman.—Is it your opinion that a master who has to exercise rigorous discipline during five days of the week on secular matters, is not very acceptable to the children as a teacher of religion?—I don't think he is, and I know another thing I observe with regard to it, that the children are inclined to desert themselves very inopportunely when religious instruction commences, particularly the children who come from Sunday schools. They sometimes look upon it as a signal for fun, and from the way the teacher is circumstanced in the daily school, of course he has to make all the children sit down, hush a little, and listen to the reading of the Scripture, and the little ones will naturally get uneasy, and cause a row if they can.

18532. Mr. Stokes.—What is the average attendance at your school?—About fifty.

18533. What assistance is provided for you by the Board?—I have no assistance whatever. I had eight or nine monitors from time to time, but they all left me, having got appointments. One of these went as a clerk, and expects to get £150 a year.

18534. Then you have now no monitors?—Not one provided by the Board. I have no paid monitors.

18535. The Bishop of Meath.—Do you consider the elementary books of the Board adequate for that purpose?—I have not much experience of the present books yet. I think there is some deficiency in the gradation of them. I think they become too hard suddenly. They are not properly graduated.

18536. You would interpolate some lessons as the gradation from one book to another?—Yes.

18537. Do you object to them on any other ground, or would you propose any improvement in them in any other respect?—Well, I know there has been a good deal of objection started to them, but I am disposed to take very liberal views in that way. I am not disposed to be captious.

18538. On the whole in the hands of a judicious teacher, you think they are perfectly adequate to the purposes for which they are designed?—I think a clever teacher might turn them to any purpose.

18539. I am only speaking of a good purpose?—Well, I think they are a fair set of lesson books.

18540. The Chairman.—Is it an advantage to the teacher to have a specified set of books, or would it be better to give him some latitude in the selection?—I think it would be better there should be some latitude in that way, to let the teacher use any set of books he

Nov. 26, 1868  
Mr. Charles  
Stanhope.

considered best, provided, of course, that there was nothing objectionable in them in a religious or moral point of view. I think it would be better that the teacher should have the power of selecting, or the manager and teacher combined, whatever class books he considered most suitable to his school.

18541. Has the State ever profused to pay the whole salary of the teacher?—No, it is a grant in aid of local salary, but the teachers have not been supported locally to the extent they ought to have been.

18542. In the year 1845, I see by the answer addressed by the National Board to the teachers, the highest salary paid was £20, to the first class?—Yes, I recollect that time.

18543. I see by the same return that that has been raised by six or seven gradations until now the three payments to the first-class teachers are £32, £44, and £58, and that a similar increase has been made in the salaries of the second and third class. If the amount received from local sources had increased to the same extent as that given by the State, would the schoolmasters have much to complain of?—Well, they would be much better off—perhaps if that amount were doubled, and if the locality added half as much more they might be considered as fairly remunerated.

18544. What is the smallest number of children which you consider necessary to keep a school efficient and active?—I think there might be a very fair school where more children could not be got into it, with an attendance of thirty or so. I think there would be sufficient work for a man. In fact, the master would have far more work where he has a school of thirty or thirty-five, than with a larger school, where he has the assistance of monitors, and that is one reason why a poor teacher should not be cut down on account of having a smaller school, when he has, in fact, more work to do, from the absence of monitors, than if his school were larger.

18545. Is it, in the interest of the tax-payer, worth while to pay a full salary for a school that has less than twenty-five children?—What is that place to do for education? Are the people to be left savages? They must have a school, and if the circumstances of the locality are favourable, if it is a mountainous district, for example, I think it would be very hard that the people should be deprived of education of some sort.

18546. Mr. Deane.—You spoke, amongst the things that would be beneficial to teachers, and also useful for education, of agriculture, and you said agriculture should be taught practically, in more schools than it is at present. Have you had, yourself, any connection with agricultural teaching in any of the schools where you have been teacher?—No.

18547. Have you any special knowledge of the subject yourself?—In training, I heard lectures on it from Mr. Skilling, the agriculturist.

18548. What was the idea that was in your mind when you mentioned that to the Commission, or had you any special scheme in your mind?—The teachers at the conference in Omagh suggested that many of them could teach agriculture under proper encouragement.

18549. You mean teaching it practically?—Yes, in many places where it is not already taught.

18550. Do you contemplate that for that purpose some land should be attached to the school?—There should be some land.

18551. Have you seen any of the smaller class of agricultural schools; have they come under your attention anywhere?—No.

18552. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you think the teachers generally partake of your opinion, that there should be a latitude with regard to the books, that the teacher should have the power of selecting books within a certain range?—I have heard teachers express that opinion, but I cannot say it is the general opinion.

18553. You, yourself, think it would be good?—I think it would be a good thing. I see very nice lesson-books on various subjects, issued by publishing companies in England.

18554. Do you think, as a practical teacher, it would at all interfere with the general system of education, to have different sets of lesson-books in different schools?—Well, it might be an obstacle in this way: the teachers are required to study the lesson-books, and answer upon them at their examination, and if the books were not the same it might interfere with that part of the examination; except they named particular subjects, and let the teacher make up his knowledge from any source.

18555. Would it not be easy to obviate that difficulty?—Yes, by naming the subject, and letting him acquire his knowledge from whatever source he likes, but they think it shows that the teacher will be better able to teach the books when he is intimately acquainted with them.

18556. As far as your experience goes is there much fluctuation of children from one school to another, in cases where there is no change of residence?—Well, in towns they do run about pretty much.

18557. Is that the choice of the parents or the whims of the children?—Sometimes they leave when asked for school fees, and go to another school. Sometimes, of course, they feel offended by something the teacher has done, perhaps he has chided them, or perhaps punished them slightly, and they may take offence at it.

18558. Does that prevail to a great extent?—Well, I cannot say in my school that it does—I find children coming sometimes to my school complaining they were not getting on well in other schools.

18559. Mr. Stokes.—Would you say that teaching in primary schools affords a suitable career for an energetic and ambitious man?—Well, I don't think it would for an ambitious man, his ambition must be very limited if it does; but I think it requires a highly energetic man to properly teach a school.

18560. Would you not expect persons of that disposition speedily to quit schools for other careers?—Well, a very ambitious man might, but a highly energetic man will find enough to exercise his energies upon in a school.

18561. Mr. O'Keefe.—When you speak of using different books in the schools, do you not think there should be great care taken that the books might be subject to some objection in a religious point of view?—Certainly; I mentioned that—I said they should be free from all sectarian bias of any kind.

Rev. James  
Forster.

The Rev. JAMES FORSTER sworn and examined

18562. Mr. Sullivan.—You are a Presbyterian clergyman?—I am.

18563. Of the General Assembly, I believe?—Yes, the General Assembly.

18564. You reside at Kilkenny?—I do.

18565. I believe you have paid considerable attention to the subject of National education?—I cannot say that I have paid very great attention, but I am a regular visitor of the model school at Kilkenny; I go

there once a week for religious instruction, except when prevented by other duties.

18566. You give religious instruction regularly at the model school?—Yes.

18567. Are you a patron of any school besides?—I am not.

18568. Have you been, previous to going to Kilkenny?—No, never.

18569. In your knowledge of the National system

confined to the model schools?—Yes, I should say so. I have not attended to the general system much, my attention has been confined to the model school at Kilkenny.

18570 Have you ever made any objections to the books that were used in model schools?—I did, about the commencement of the present year.

18571 Which books are they may I ask?—The edition of school books published in 1867.

18572 All of them?—To the Second, Third, and Fourth Book.

18573 What is the nature of your objection to those books?—The teaching of some of the passages in those books I looked upon as not suitable for the children that I look after, nor for Protestant children generally.

18574 Had those passages in which you objected a religious character?—I consider so.

18575 To whom did you make your objection—to the Commissioners?—I made my objection by a note in the Visitors' Book of the school.

18576 Did you address any communication to the Commissioners?—No, I did not at first.

18577 Had you any conversation, at any time, with the teachers of the school upon the subject?—No, I had not.

18578 At any time?—No.

18579 Did you ever object in the school itself, in the presence of the pupils or the teachers, to the passages?—I objected, in writing, in the infants' school, and also in writing in the boys' school in the Visitors' Book. In the girls' school I simply pointed to a passage in the fourth book, which the child of one of my sisters had in her hand, and I merely remarked to the teacher who was in charge, and said, "I don't consider that a proper passage in a school book."

18580 That was Miss Thorne?—Yes; that was Miss Thorne.

18581 Was that said in the presence of the children?—The class was being trained in reading, but they were under examination by her at the time, they were not reading; nor did I specify the particulars of the passage. I merely pointed to it without specifying what it was to her, or in her hearing.

18582 Did you ever object to them to Miss Louisa?—Miss Louisa was mistress of the infants' school, my objection there was made in writing in the book; it was in the school-room, but at her desk at a considerable distance from the classes that were in charge of her assistants. I had no conversation on the subject in the hearing of any one. What I did was in writing.

18583 What was the passage to which you objected?—The passage in the infants' school book to which I objected was one called the Angels' Whisper—Love's song of the Angels' Whispers.

18584 You considered that was a passage tending to propagate Roman Catholic doctrines?—It tended to propagate what I would not consider children should receive. It might be very well for a sentiment for you or me to sing who have formed our ideas, but I do not consider it a fit passage to be read in an infant school by Protestant children.

18585 What were the words you objected to?—It is a stanza commencing with these words:—

\* Her beads white she numbered,  
Her baby still slumbered."

18586 Are you aware who it was that compiled the Second, Third, and Fourth Books?—I don't know who compiled the books.

18587 Are you aware who formed the committee that appointed them?—I have no knowledge on the subject whatever.

18588 Did not Miss Louisa tell you they were made under the direction of a Presbyterian, a member of your Church?—No, she never uttered such a statement to me. I did not consider it right to say a word to a teacher upon the subject. Considering that the teachers were there simply to discharge their duty as

servants of the Board, I do not consider that they were responsible in any way for those books.

18589 There was an inquiry on the subject?—There was, into charges preferred against me by the Inspector.

18590 Are you aware what were the charges of the Inspector?—I have them from the Inspector in writing, and can lay them before you if you choose. On the 6th of February last I made this minute in the Visitors' Book of the school—"Visited the schools this day. The children were clean and orderly. I examined the school books in use, and I feel bound to state that in my opinion they contain many passages exceedingly objectionable, and contrary to the faith of children of Protestant parents. I would specify Second Book, page 180; Third Book, page 181, Fourth Book, page 22, 175, 173, 338, 324, and 381."

18591 Was this in the infant school book?—No; this was the minute I made in the boys' school. The minute in the other book I don't recollect. I have not got a copy of the exact words. It was not so long as the minute I have read; it only referred to one book.

18592 Was it to this effect?—"I consider a portion of the Angels' Whispers in the Second Reading Book in use in this school, objectionable, and such as should not be found in a book designed for the instruction of children of all creeds?"—Yes, I should say it was to that effect.

18593 You stated you were going to read the report of the Inspector?—Yes. I read those minutes in the books on the 6th of February, and on the 7th of February it appears a report was made of them by the District Inspector to the Board, and there was also a letter written to the District Inspector from the head teacher of the school, a copy of which was sent to the Board, laying certain charges against me of which I knew nothing until a considerable time afterwards, when I was waited upon by the Head Inspector, who informed me that serious charges had been made to the Board against me, and asked me was I prepared to submit to an investigation into them. I said I was prepared to go into a defence of anything connected with my conduct in the school, and I asked him to be good enough to give me a specific indictment in writing stating what the charges were. He said he would do so and here is the specific indictment in writing against me:—

Copy of a PAMPHLET in letter addressed to the Secretaries of the Commission of National Education on the 7th February, instant, by Lewis HARRIS, esq., District Inspector of National Schools:—

"1. I have received a report from the head mistress of the infant department, informing me that the Rev. Mr. Porter visited her room and expressed to her and to her assistant, Mrs. Carroll, who is a Roman Catholic, his objection to a passage in the Second Book, being the second verse of a poem beginning with the words, 'Her beads white she numbered.' Of three mistresses in the room at the time, two were Roman Catholics.

"2. In his visit to the female school the Rev. Mr. Porter proceeded at once to where the fifth, the highest class, then in charge of Miss Thorne, stood. He took occasion to inform the teacher that there were many passages in the book from which she was teaching that were objectionable, to prove which he took a book from the hands of one of the pupils, turned to page 178 (Fourth Book), pointed to a passage beginning with the words, 'Soon after the good lady made the sign of the cross,' and declared it to be objectionable. At the moment these words were spoken, there stood three Roman Catholic girls of the ages of thirteen, fifteen, and sixteen.

"3. On questioning the head master of the male school, Mr. Ryan, I have ascertained from him that since the revision of the Board's reading books he has been exposed during school hours to the frequent reprehensions of the Rev. Mr. Porter upon what he conceives to be doctrinal points raised within these books."

Copy of a LETTER addressed to Mr. Harkin, District Inspector, on the 10th February, instant, by Mr. Ryan, head master of the Kilkenny model school:—

"Sir,—At eleven o'clock this morning, and before the classes had been referred after religious instruction, the

Nov. 26, 1869

Rev. James  
Porter.

Nov. 26, 1898.

Rev. James  
Porter

Rev. Mr. Porter came into the boys' school-room and asked me in a voice sufficiently loud to be heard by the pupils, to have the Inspector's office opened in order that he might hold a conference therein with the Rev. Mr. Gorman and the Rev. Mr. De Montigny, two clergymen of the Established Church. These two gentlemen had been giving religious instruction in these schools during the morning. Rev. Mr. Porter had not.

"I told the Rev. Mr. Porter that I did not hold the key of the office, and that over that department I had no control. He then entered the laboratory, and demanded that I would furnish him with a copy of the following books, now in the hands of the children: Second Book, Third Book, and Fourth Book. I now told him that I could not so far interfere with school business as to take these books from the children's hands, and requested the rev. gentleman not to interfere in a discussion with which I could have nothing to say. He then said, 'Do you refuse to procure me the books?' I reminded him that it was outside my duty to furnish books to any visitor, and that it was better that he obtained the books from some other source. He again demanded, 'Do you refuse to let me have the books?' My reply was, 'I do.' He then left."

"During the above neither of the other clergymen entered the room, nor of course had any share in this conversation. But when the Rev. Mr. Porter left me, Rev. Mr. Gorman came in and said that he was requested by some of the parents to examine those books, and asked if I was acting under rule in refusing to furnish copies of the books to Rev. Mr. Porter. My reply to this was that a compliance with the request of the Rev. Mr. Porter would constitute an interference with the rules of the Board, for which I would be held responsible; but that if the Rev. Mr. Gorman wished I would, after asked leave, send him a set of the books required. The Rev. Mr. Gorman then left, apparently well satisfied with this arrangement."

"I have the honour, &c., &c.,

"L. J. RYAN,

"Head Master."

"L. Harkin, esq., District Inspector."

18594. On both occasions, then, there were several of the pupils present when the observations were made, according to that statement?—Yes, but the question is, is that statement the fact?

18595. Is it the fact?—It is not.

18596. In what does it deviate from the truth?—It deviates from the truth in saying that I mentioned books, or cross, or anything of that sort. I never used the term. I never repeated a word of the passage I objected to to any of the pupils or to my teacher. The statement is untrue in that respect. It is also untrue that I interrupted the business of the school. It is perfectly untrue, and the Board so decided after an investigation of the evidence laid before them.

18597. The Chairman.—Did you merely point out the passages to which you objected with your finger to the master or mistress, or do you mean that you named them also, out of the hearing of the other people?—What I did was this: the girls were standing in the class when I went forward and said to one of them, whose name was Martin Smith, "Is that the Fourth Book in your hand?" She said yes, and handed it to me. I turned to the page, and handed the book open to the teacher, pointed with my finger to the passage, and said, "That passage I consider objectionable in a mixed school."

18598. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Was this matter investigated by the Board?—Yes, it was investigated by their Head Inspector, and very much annoyed I was at being exposed to such trouble, which I thought I had no right to be.

18599. Mr. Sedgewick.—What was the Board's decision in the matter?—After the investigation was closed I heard nothing from the Board for some weeks, and eventually I wrote to know what decision they had come to with reference to the charges preferred against me, and the investigation held, and I received from the Board this reply:

18600. May I ask were you examined on the subject by the Head Inspector?—I was. The investigation occupied two entire days, and a great number of witnesses were examined. I asked the Board to supply me with a copy of the evidence laid before them by

the Inspector, and they declined. If I had an opportunity of laying it before you it would show you how the case exactly stands.

18601. Were you not present during the examination?—I was.

18602. All the time?—All the time.

18603. Is the evidence on such occasions given on oath?—It was not so in this case. I believe it is not usual.

18604. Rev. Mr. Conic.—Did the investigation take place at your request or at the request of some other person?—It took place by order of the Board.

18605. At whose request?—I cannot tell.

18606. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Was it at your request?—Not at all.

18607. The Chairman.—Was it on the report of the Inspector on the letters he received from the teacher?—I made the minute I have read in the Visitor's Book on the 6th of February. The Inspector reported my action in that on the 7th, and I was waited upon by the Head Inspector sometime afterwards informing me that certain charges had been preferred to the Board against me, and to know if I was prepared to enter into an investigation of them.

18608. Was the letter of the teacher conveyed to the Commissioners along with the report of the District Inspector?—Yes; I understand the letter along with the report of the District Inspector were communicated to the Board.

18609. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—May I ask did the Commissioners of National Education lay a series of charges against you and proceed to prosecute them?—Yes, there they are under the hand of their Head Inspector.

18610. Did it occur to you that you should submit to such an examination?—I thought it was a most unwarrantable proceeding altogether on the part of the Board.

18611. Do you regard such a proceeding as that calculated to maintain your position and authority with the children of your communion who were under your charge in the school?—It was calculated to injure me very materially, for the report went through the town that I had interfered with the education of the children, and that I had been abusing Roman Catholic doctrines and practices; and I was very much annoyed indeed—such a report being wholly untrue.

18612. Mr. Sedgewick.—Now, if you please, give us the decision of the Commissioners?—I shall read it for you.

No. 2

2227—68

KILKEEN DISTRICT MODEL SCHOOLS.

Office of National Education,

25th March, 1898.

REV. SIR,—The Commissioners of National Education have had before them the Report of the Inquiry held by Mr. Sheridan, one of the Head Inspectors, into the statements made by Mr. Harkin, District Inspector, as to the interruption by you of the business of the above school, as referred to in your letter of the 12th instant.

We are directed to state, that the Commissioners are not anxious to conclude that the business of the school was interrupted by you on the occasion in question; but they regret that you should have made observations in the Visitor's Book, which should have been addressed to the Commissioners only.

We are, Rev. Sir, your obedient servants,

JAMES KELLY, }  
W. H. NEWELL, } Secretaries

Rev. JAMES PORTER,

The Mission, Kilkenny.

18613. Do you think the latter part of that decision just?—It is just so far as it goes, but it is not full enough, and that was my annoyance with the Board. I thought they should have given a much fuller decision. They did decide upon the charge as to interrupting the teaching in the school; they did not decide on the charge of speaking in the hearing of Roman Catholic pupils or Roman Catholic teachers. I hold that the evidence fully bears out that I did



Nov. 26, 1868

Rev. James  
Porter.

nothing of the sort. I asked for a fuller decision, but they declined to re-open the case.\*

18614. Do you think it judicious for a clergyman, a visitor of a model school, to write observations of that sort in a book open to public inspection, and to speak to the teachers who are only instruments in carrying out the system?—On the Visitors' Book visitors are requested to record such observations as they think fit on the state of the school.

18615. Is it part of the province of the Visitors' Book to contain observations on the books published by authority of the Commissioners?—I could not consider a school in a satisfactory state when the books are not proper.

18616. The books are part of the system and published by the Commissioners?—Of course the books are published by the authority of the Commissioners.

18617. Then in writing such an objection upon the Visitors' Book, there is an objection to the whole system of National education?—No, there is not.

18618. Are not the books part of the system?—I don't see how that would apply, you may find fault with something in the system though you admit that the system is a good one on the whole. I may find fault with my wife but I do not condemn her on that account.

18619. Was not placing that minute on the Visitors' Book in order that the whole public might see it, objecting to an essential portion of the system?—I consider that this edition of the books was a departure from what had been previously satisfactory. The books up to that time I consider were satisfactory. The edition of 1867 I considered should not have contained those passages, and I thought that a violation of faith with the public.

18620. Although compiled by a Presbyterian?—I had no knowledge of that.

18621. Are you not aware that they were selected by Mr. McCready?—I did not know anything of the sort.

18622. When you told on that occasion that they were selected by Mr. McCready?—No, I was not. I knew nothing of the new edition having been published till my attention was called to them by a gentleman whose children attended the school. I had been from home during the first month of the year, and on returning, my attention was called to the books by a gentleman whose children were at the school. I said, I could say nothing until I had seen the books myself. It was then I first learned that a new edition had been placed in the children's hands—I then obtained a copy from the head teacher of the school. I said, "Will you let me have a copy of the books," and he politely handed them to me. I brought them home and looked over them, and having made up my mind with reference to them, I then went to the school, and on the 6th of February, I made that minute. I only knew that the books were published by the sanction and authority of the Commissioners. As to who compiled them I knew nothing whatever.

18623. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you not aware that two of the Inspectors were the parties whose business was to prepare that edition and were paid for it, neither of whom was Mr. McCready?—I have heard that since. I have since seen it in a return of the cost of the edition made to the House of Commons.

18624. Do you think the Commissioners themselves

regarded these new books as a part of the system when they have since withdrawn them?—Certainly not.

18625. Mr. Sullivan.—With reference to a question put by Dr. Wilson, I may draw your attention to the fact that the Commissioners under their own hand have stated that it was Mr. McCready who edited these books—the returns supplied to us state, "Second Book of Lessons, compiled by W. McCready, assisted by H. P. Clarke, esq."—I was not aware of that, what is the date of it?

18626. There are two books, one is dated 1867 and the other 1865, and there has been no edition of it since. That is the statement made by the Commissioners themselves?—It would not have the least effect on my objection who was the person that compiled the books.

18627. Do you not feel you made a fatal objection to the whole system by showing that no two people can agree upon a work to be read in a school?—I don't feel anything of the sort.

18628. If everyone had the same right and title to object to this passage and to that passage in a book, what would it come to in the end?—If the Board of Education profess not to interfere with the creed of any party, and to publish works that will not trample upon any peculiar views of any denomination, and if they depart from that, then I think they should be brought back to that principle again. That is all I desire.

18629. But if every person was allowed to object after the same fashion in which you have objected, and if the passages objected to were removed, what would become of the books intended for the general instruction of the people—how would it be possible to teach general literature at all if every man could object to what didn't please himself?—I think every man of common sense can understand there is sufficient literature in the world for general purposes without interfering with the peculiar views of any one.

18630. What religious views are contained in the passage at page 186 of the Third Book of Lessons, that is one of the passages you objected to, if I mistake not?—If I had the book before me I could point out the parts.—

18631. Here is the book (book handed to witness)?—This is not the proper book—this is the 1865 edition, it is the 1867 edition I object to.

18632. Well, what is the particular passage that you allude to?—It is the story headed "The Dead Ass."

18633. Mr. Gibson.—It is the duty of the Commissioners, I presume, to take care that their books should be free from any matter that is objectionable according to the religious opinions of any particular sect or denomination of the people?—I have always so understood.

18634. When you found these books to which you objected in the schools, did you think their being there was the act of the Commissioners and not of the teacher. Was anything done in that school except by the authority of the Commissioners?—Not that I am aware of.

18635. Do you not think now on further consideration that it would have been much better to have addressed your communication to the Commissioners than to the subordinates, by putting it upon the face of the Visitors' Book? I take it that the object of that book is to bring under the notice of the teacher mat-

\* The following letter was handed in by Mr. Porter.—

KILBERRY DISTRICT MODEL SCHOOL.

Rev. Sir.—Having laid before the Board at the meeting yesterday your letter of the 2nd instant, we are directed to inform you, that the Commissioners of National Education see no reason for re-opening a case which has already been fully considered.

With respect to the head master, Mr. Ryan, he desires that he ever used language calculated to offend you.

We are to state, in conclusion, that the Commissioners invariably decline to give copies of the Reports or letters of their Inspectors.

We are, Rev. Sir, your obedient servants,

JAMES KELLY, }  
W. H. NORMAN, } Secretaries.

Rev. James Porter, The Manor, Kilberry.

No. 26, 28/55.  
Rev. James  
Parson.

ters which are under his control, and for which he is responsible, and not matters for which the Commissioners are responsible. I put it to you now whether you do not think that upon the whole it would have been better to have addressed your communications to the Commissioners than to have made the entries in the book in the school?—Well, perhaps if I was going over the same course of conduct again, my experience might have led me to address the Commissioners directly in the first place, but it occurred to me at the time that the readiest way to call attention to the matter was to put it upon the Visitors' Book, which was under the observation of the Inspector, so that he might see it, and see that there was objection taken to the books.

18636. Do you think if you had addressed a letter to the Commissioners themselves it would not have been brought under the notice of the Board, and action taken upon it as promptly as by the course you adopted of entering the objection on the Visitors' Book of the school?—I have no doubt whatever in my mind but that the Commissioners would have attended to the letter and considered it, but I do not believe the action would have been so prompt. I have no doubt they would have attended to it.

18637. On what ground do you form that opinion, that the action in reference to the matter could not have been so prompt?—I form it upon this ground—that attention being called to the matter in the very district itself where the parents of the children would come to understand it, prompt action would thereby be induced on the part of the Commissioners, so as to remedy what was felt to be amiss, as soon as possible.

18638. Would that prompt action have been induced then by the voice of the people in the district more than by your own letter to the Commissioners direct on the subject?—My reason for stating so, and for making the note as I did, was that I was spoken to by several of the parents about the matter of these books and urged by them to take action about them, and I not only made that minute, but it was counter-signed by one of the magistrates of the county.

18639. The Chairman.—Did you think that by making this entry in the Visitors' Book you were putting yourself less prominently forward in the matter than if you had written a formal letter directly to the Commissioners?—Yes.

18640. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In fact, did you think that it was a matter the Board's own officers should prosecute rather than you should?—Unquestionably.

18641. Mr. Wilson.—Do you think the Board's own officers should serve signatures to the conduct of the Board in publishing certain books?—No; but I think it would be the duty of the Board's Inspectors to inform the Board of objections which were made.

18642. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it not required by the rules of the Board that the Inspectors should take special notice of whatever objections are made in the Visitors' Book, and make them known to the Commissioners?—I would say so.

18643. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you think it possible, if your system were carried out, that any book could be written for the National system?—I think it perfectly possible. I think the English language and literature are not so barren as not to afford ample materials for general instruction.

18644. Mr. Wilson.—Do you think that every person who objects to any proceedings of the Board, with reference to the system, is at liberty to enter those objections in the Visitors' Book—whether that is a judicious and wise course?—I think if there is a Visitors' Book kept, and a special request made to the public to enter their observations in it, I don't understand the meaning of such a request being made if they are not at liberty to record objections in it.

18645. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Do you think that books employed under the National system should contain an reference whatever to any Roman Catholic customs or views of history?—If the doing so would trench upon the views of any other party of Christian people I think it should not be found in the books.

18646. Are the children attending schools in Ireland to be kept then in total ignorance of the differences between various sections of the people on religious matters?—I would leave that to the clergy of the respective churches.

18647. Would you exclude the history of Europe altogether from the schools and from the books?—Certainly not.

18648. How is it possible to teach people the history of Europe without letting them know that there have been great disputes and wars and dissensions upon religious questions, and that the habits and customs of people have varied according to their religious persuasions in days gone by—do you think that no history at all should be taught?—On the contrary, I do not think there is history enough taught in the schools.

18649. With respect to the passage to which you objected—Queen Philippa making the sign of the cross—suppose it was historically true that she did do so, what objection could there be to the children being taught that as a matter of history?—If Queen Philippa chose to make the sign of the cross I really have no objection to her doing so, or to any body else doing it if they like, and I did not object to the passage on that ground.

18650. On what ground did you object?—My objection to that passage is, that it is stated by the historian, in connexion with it, that she never did say thing by act or deed to discredit her to the glories of heaven—that is a statement which, I hold, is not for children, according to my views, to receive.

18651. Then it was not about making the sign of the cross you objected?—Not at all; it was to the other statement. The sign of the cross is neither here nor there in my mind.

18652. Mr. Sullivan.—And what is your objection to the passage about the beads?—The stanza I allude to is as follows:—

"Her beads as she numbered  
The babe still dandled;  
And smiled in her face as she bowed her knee;  
Oh! shouldst be that weeping,  
My child, thy sleep adorning,  
For I know that the angels are whispering with thee."

How do you know it? I don't know it, and to teach a child to say that they know the angels are whispering is what I don't understand.

18653. Mr. Wilson.—Do you not believe that there are ministering spirits sent to minister unto the children of God on earth?—Yes; but I don't know what spirit is whispering to you now.

18654. Mr. Sullivan.—In the passage which you have referred to—"The Dead Ass"—will you point out what it is you object to there?—It is the spirit of the whole passage I object to; this person made a pilgrimage.

18655. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Was it this?—This story of this dead ass. A certain person went on a pilgrimage to Santiago, and he took his ass with him to help him on his way. He found that if he made this pilgrimage one of his children that was sick would be spared to him. He vowed he would make the pilgrimage. Heaven, it is stated here, accepted the condition. He proceeded on the journey. The ass died. He succeeded, however, in making the pilgrimage and returned, and the story makes it appear that the child was spared to him because he made that vow and pilgrimage. Now I object to the whole spirit of that passage, because of that.

18656. The Chairman.—From what author is that story taken, do you remember?—From Scroon, I think it is.

18657. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you not think, taking the author into account, it would lead to a precisely opposite result to what you suggest?—The children are not to know who is the author.

18658. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Do you think it possible for any history to be compiled that could be used in the National schools of Ireland?—I don't know; it has not

been tried, so far as I am aware, yet, to compile a history that would be acceptable.

18638. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you think it would, when the Commissioners of National Education didn't find themselves competent for the performance of the task?—I don't remember ever hearing that they ever made any attempt at it.

18639. Mr. Sullivan.—Don't you think that proves the impossibility of compiling a set of books for a mixed school?—No, I don't see how that is at all; it does not follow that because the Commissioners never tried to do it, the thing is impossible.

18640. If they tried, and found they could not agree upon it?—I am not aware that the attempt has ever been made by them.

18641. Well, that it has not been made by them proves, at least, that in their judgment it was impracticable?—I do not know that.

18642. If the subject was considered by the Board of Education, and they deemed it impracticable to carry such a scheme out, does it not show that, so far as their judgment goes, the matter was, in their opinion, impracticable?—If they tried it, and found it impracticable, it would follow of course.

18643. Rev. Mr. Cruise.—Would a true history of Ireland be acceptable to persons of all religions and opinions in Ireland?—No, because the truth is not acceptable to all persons.

18644. Do you think truth should be excluded from the Board's books?—Certainly not, but the fact of its not being acceptable to all should not prevent it being tried.

18645. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you in view in that answer a "half" history of Ireland? In other words, don't you think it possible to compile a history so as to give in it the leading facts of history, without offending the prejudices of anyone in this country?—I think that would be possible.

18646. In that answer do you contemplate a full history, or merely a compilation of leading facts?—I don't mean a full detailed history of all the occurrences; that, of course, would be offensive to many parties.

18647. The *Chalmers*.—Could you include the account of the Battle of the Boyne in neutral terms?—It ought to be acceptable, because the battle of the Boyne ought not offend any party; it is a historic fact we cannot deny.

18648. Mr. Sullivan.—Does history only consist of facts?—It ought to be founded upon facts.

18649. Does it not also consist of inferences or inductions from facts?—Of course.

18650. Do not the inferences generally constitute the most valuable parts of history?—Facts lay the basis for the inferences, and the inferences teach us to avoid errors, and what to follow.

18651. Is it not a fact that it is the inferences in history which are objected to?—Well, if the facts be correct, and the inferences the proper ones they cannot be objectionable.

18652. Is it not the fact that it is the inferences, or inductions from facts, which constitute the valuable portion of history, and which are the portions objected to by persons of different opinions?—If you draw correct inferences from facts, the inferences must be as valid and as valuable as the facts.

18653. Do you know any science in which all the inferences and deductions are found to be correct?—I am not aware; I would not undertake to say they are.

18654. Could you say of any science that all its inferences were true?—I could not take it upon myself to say that.

18655. Are they likely, therefore, to be all correct in history, which is the least advanced of the sciences?—I should say not; I think there is as much incorrectness in history as in any other department of literature.

18656. Must there not necessarily be more?—Well, so histories are frequently repeated, one blunder may come in ten.

18657. Are all the inferences founded on facts of

physical science correct?—I don't undertake to say they are.

18658. Therefore, may not the same occur in history?—I have and you may draw a wrong inference; and, further, a closer investigation may bring you to a different conclusion from what the historian set forth.

18659. Consequently, who can be a better judge of the truth of the inference than the person who makes it?—Not the only person, everybody who reads it.

18660. Rev. Mr. Cruise.—Do you not consider that history is a very important part of the instruction of the young?—I think it is a very important part, I regard it as such, certainly.

18661. Is it not *prima facie* rather against a system which seems obliged to keep history out of view in its instruction, I mean against it as an effective system of education?—That depends very much upon the circumstances of the country, on the principle that what is lawful may not at all times be expedient.

18662. Mr. Stokes.—Was not your action in the matter of these books completely justified by the result?—Yes, in the judgment of the Commissioners, because they withdrew the books, and issued others in their place.

18663. Do you not think that if the Roman Catholics, instead of proceeding through their nobles and clergy to make representations to the Board and to the Government, had proceeded as you did, by making entries in the various books, they might also have succeeded in their object, and have had the books made more like what they desired to have them?—I know that books were removed from time to time from the Board's list, such as the *Scripture Lessons*, prepared by Archbishop Whately.

18664. What view do you take of the system administered by the National Board? Do you regard it as a secular system, or as a system of combined literary and moral instruction, with a great deal of religious instruction objectionable to no one, introduced into the books?—I have been always accustomed to find the system of education carried out by the Board as much as lay in my power, and I approved of it, and of the books issued under it, till that edition of which I have spoken.

18665. Is it not the fact that, in the opinion of the Commissioners, the only system they are authorized to administer is one which includes a large amount of religious instruction with secular training?—I understand a large amount of "moral" instruction, as distinguished from what is Scriptural—doctrinal.

18666. Do not the books contain extracts from Scripture?—They do.

18667. Would you concede to any other individual the right which you claim for yourself—to object to, and exclude from any of the books of the Board whatever is displeasing to him?—Certainly, I grant to every man the right which I claim for myself. I don't want to cast my shadow upon any other person's back, nor do I desire to force my views upon any other man.

18668. What was the date of the decision of the Board which you read?—The 25th of March.

18669. Did the matter end there?—It did not.

18670. Can you state what further has been done in the matter since the month of March?—Having got this letter from the Board, I asked them for a fuller decision, and some further correspondence then took place. The substance of the answer was, that the Board had already given their decision, after full consideration, and declined to go further in the matter, and would not re-open it.

18671. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Were you one of the parties nominated by the General Assembly to appear as a witness before the Commissioners?—No, I was never nominated, to my knowledge.

[At this stage the room was cleared, and on re-adjourning the examination was resumed, as follows:—]

18672. How is it then you appear, may I ask you?—I cannot tell that; I received a letter from the Assistant Secretary asking me to appear here.

18673. Rev. Mr. Cruise.—Have you resided long in Killybegs?—Since 1848.

Nov. 26, 1848.  
Rev. James  
Kester.

Nov. 26, 1868.

Rev. James Porter

18695. Is there much mixed education in Kilkenny besides the mixed education of the model schools?—There is not very much latterly; there was a good deal more up to lately.

18696. Have you any school attached to your own congregation?—No, I have not.

18697. Do the children of your denomination all attend the model school?—All that are within a convenient distance of it attend it.

18698. How far have they to come to it?—Some of them have to come four or five miles.

18699. Are they, generally speaking, children of persons in a comfortable condition of life?—Not very comfortable.

18700. Farmers?—Some farmers and some shopkeepers.

18701. Have you many of a position superior to that, such as professional persons—surgons, or such like?—No, not connected with my Church.

18702. Did you send an answer to the circular sent by us to your opinion of the efficiency of the model schools?—I got no circular.

18703. We asked a number of persons by circular whether they thought the model schools acceptable?—I did not get any circular of the kind. I knew that several persons did get something of the kind, but I never received one.

18704. Is the model school in Kilkenny very acceptable to the people there?—I think it is.

18705. Is the education given there good in the opinion of the people, so far as you know of it?—The people consider it a very good education, and I am quite of that mind.

18706. Do you think that the class of persons attending that school is the class which the State is bound to benefit out of the public funds by the estab-

lishment of such schools?—I think some of them are rather above that class.

18707. And able to pay more for education than 5s. a quarter?—I believe there are some able to pay more than the 5s. 5s. required. I have no doubt there are some there able to pay more, and ought to pay more.

18708. Do you think if some plan were adopted by which persons able to do so should pay more, the school would be more acceptable to the people?—I have no doubt it would be acceptable. It would be acceptable to the parties whose children attend model schools at the present time.

18709. Do you think the people would be willing to form a committee, and take the expense upon themselves of carrying on the school, if the State were to offer them the building?—I think not. We have not sufficient material for that.

18710. Mr. Stokes—Is your chapel contiguous to the model school?—Close to, alongside of it.

18711. Was the chapel or model school built first?—The chapel.

18712. Rev. Dr. Wilson—One witness already examined from Kilkenny says, with reference to the instruction in those schools:—

“I find the tone of the people with whom I have come in contact has altered very much. I find that the youths of my flock, and of other flocks with whom I come in contact, who were educated by the National Board are of a very different temper and bearing from others. There is an independent liberalism which I do not like. I feel persuaded that Protestantism would never have had such a footing in the country if it was not for the influence of the present system of education on the minds of the people. It is a system opposed to all religion.”

Do you concur in the opinion expressed by that witness?—I do not concur in it, most decidedly not.

[Adjourned.]

## FORTY-NINTH DAY.—DUBLIN, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1868.

## PRESENT.

The Right Hon. The Earl of Pomeroy, Chairman.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, K.B.  
The Right Hon. Lord CROMBIE.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., M.P.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORRIS COWIE, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASHBY STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.P.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C. } Secretaries.  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

JOHN GORDON, Esq., sworn and examined.

Nov. 27, 1868.

John Gordon, esq.

18713. The Chairman—Are you one of the Inspectors under the National Board of Education?—I am.

18714. How long have you filled that office?—Over three years.

18715. What is your district?—Galway.

18716. Have you served in any other district?—I have, in Tynon, in the county of Galway.

18717. Did you previously hold any educational appointment in Canada?—I did.

18718. What was it?—Head master of a Grammar school, with the Common schools of the town combined with the Grammar school. What is known in Canada as a Union school.

18719. In what place?—First in Petersburg, and afterwards in Port Hope, in Canada West.

18720. Was your appointment under the Colonial Government, or under some local authority?—Under a local authority.

18721. What was the body that appointed you?—The body was the combined Board of Grammar school trustees and Common school trustees.

18722. How long did you fill that appointment?—Taking both towns, over eleven years.

18723. Should you be able to afford the Commissioners information as to the scheme of common schools prevailing in Canada?—I think so.

18724. Sir Albert Kane—You mentioned that your appointment was made by the combined authority of the Grammar school trustees and of the Common school trustees—was that position a special one peculiar in your case, or is it the ordinary way in which masters of common schools and common schools united?—Not usually.

18725. Then your case was a somewhat special one?—Not my case alone. I was head master of the Grammar school, but there is a provision in the Act whereby the Common school trustees may be united with the Grammar school trustees in special cases where the Grammar schoolmaster is willing to take the responsibility of all the public education in the town. Such was my case.

18726. You had charge of all the teaching in that town, both of the Common schools, or, as we would call them, the primary schools, and of the Grammar schools?—I had.

18727. Is it the fact that a large portion of the

management and control of the schools in Canada is vested in the local municipal or other local authorities?—Unusually so, I should say.

18728. Under legislative arrangements?—Decidedly.

18729. And the schools are supported by funds raised by local taxation to a considerable extent?—To a considerable extent.

18730. The control of the schools and the appointment of the teachers are vested in a body of trustees who are elected?—Yes.

18731. By whom are they elected?—By the ratepayers.

18732. By the rate-payers of the district?—Yes.

18733. Does there exist in Canada anything corresponding to the position of what we call the patron of a National school there?—Nothing.

18734. The system of Common schools for primary education in Canada therefore is fundamentally different from that which exists in this country, inasmuch as it is supported principally by local rates, and its management is vested in certain authorities who are elected by the rate-payers of the locality?—It is different in these respects.

18735. No one individual, if I understand you rightly, can exercise the power of appointing or dismissing at his pleasure the master of a school in Canada?—No, such a thing is not possible in Canada. No one individual can do so.

18736. And in case of a complaint, whether for inefficiency or misconduct, being made against a master, what is the mode in which that master can be punished, whether by removal or otherwise?—The charge will be submitted to the Board of school trustees through their secretary, and will be treated in open Board—the local Board being a corporation.

18737. The local Board in each case is constituted as a corporation for the purposes of the school management?—It is.

18738. What is the official title of the school Board, or of those persons who have the authority and management of the school?—The Board of school trustees. In the case of Common schools, the Board of Common school trustees. In the case of Grammar schools, the Board of Grammar school trustees.

18739. Then they may be briefly spoken of where we have occasion to refer to them, as the school trustees?—They may.

18740. In what manner do these school trustees when about to appoint a schoolmaster ascertain his competency?—He holds a certificate of qualification, which is one test; and he is expected to present testimonials from the late Board of school trustees where he may have taught, and from his diognyma.

18741. Is that certificate of competency derived from the examining authority absolutely necessary?—It is, in regard of the Common schools.

18742. Who are the parties that examine for that certificate of schoolmaster?—The local Board, known as the County Board of Public Instruction, and consisting of the Grammar school trustees appointed for the county, and the Local Superintendent, or Superintendents in case of more than one, who correspond to our Inspectors of National schools.

18743. Then the candidates for the certificate of the schoolmaster are examined by those parties, and the certificate granted in accordance with the result of that examination?—They are.

18744. Are the masters classified according to their degree of competency?—They are.

18745. Are you aware how the examination is conducted?—I have assisted in it.

18746. Will you describe to the Commission some details of the manner in which that examination is conducted?—The trustees within a Circuit, as it is known, are summoned for examination, just as they are summoned here in Ireland, they are examined one day by written examinations, as here; and on a second day they are examined orally, as here.

18747. You have mentioned that the teachers within a Circuit are summoned for the purpose of examination?—Yes.

18748. Does that answer imply that a person may be exercising the functions of a schoolmaster before he has been submitted to that examination?—It does; to the limited extent of the part of a year during which he may be employed before the time of examination arrives.

18749. Then those examinations are held periodically?—Yearly.

18750. And if a vacancy occurs in the school in the course of a year, the Town Council or the school trustees may exercise their power of provisional appointment, subject to the person submitting to examination, and being approved by the Council of Public Instruction?—Not exactly. The Local Superintendents, who, as I stated, correspond to our Inspectors, have the power to grant provisional certificates which serve till the annual examination.

18751. Then, before the person can at all enter into functions as a schoolmaster, he must satisfy the Local Superintendent of his competency?—He must.

18752. And if the Local Inspector reports him competent, he may be appointed by the school trustees provisionally till the time comes round for the formal examination?—He may.

18753. Does not the general Government of Canada contribute, through the Legislature, a certain portion of funds for the maintenance of the educational system?—It does.

18754. To what special object are the public funds supplied by the Government applied in carrying on this system of instruction?—To aid in paying teachers' salaries only.

18755. And how are the salaries of the higher functionaries that are charged with the governmental administration of the system paid?—I should like to understand which parties you refer to.

18756. For instance, is there any person in Canada in any position equivalent to the Board of Education here, or to the Resident Commissioner, Mr. Macdonnell?—There is.

18757. Will you describe the constitution of that superior administration?—There is a Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada, appointed by the Governor in Council, with one member of the Council appointed as Chief Superintendent of Education, and getting a salary.

18758. Is he the only member of that superior Council of Public Instruction that is paid?—I think so.

18759. Then, immediately under that governmental Council there come the County Boards?—The County Boards.

18760. Do the County Boards exercise control over the Common schools as well as over the Grammar schools?—Only in granting certificates of qualification.

18761. Only in examining and qualifying the teachers?—Yes.

18762. And not over the internal administration?—Unless when notified, as in the case of my school.

18763. With a grammar school?—With a common school.

18764. Does the Superior Council of Education in Canada publish any books for the purpose of being used in the schools, similar to our system of education under the Irish Board?—Lately it has, I believe; but not during my time much.

18765. Is it the fact that the books of the Irish National Board were very much used in the schools in Canada?—I should say almost entirely in Upper Canada.

18766. And in your experience do you think that, on the whole, they were approved—that they were considered satisfactory?—I have no doubt of it.

18767. Mr. Sullivan—Have you seen the report of the Superintendent of Education lately made on the subject of these books—the report for last year?—I have not.

18768. Are you aware whether the books are now used there in precisely the form that they are with us, or whether they have not found it necessary to arrange them in great part?—What I am aware of is, that the

Nov. 27, 1868  
John Gordon,  
cny.

books came when I was there were not the books used when I came to Ireland. We used the oldest editions in Canada.

18769 But you are not aware whether they have not at present been obliged to change them altogether in Canada?—I am not.

18770 Sir Robert Aikie.—You mentioned that the Canadian Board of Education have lately published some books of their own?—Yes.

18771 What was the object of that? Was it to substitute them for the books of the Irish National Board?—There were no reading books published in my time. The books to which I referred were arithmetic and geography, and one grammar, I think.

18772 Will you have the goodness to describe to the Commission the arrangements which are usually made in the schools of Canada West for religious instruction?—We are now talking of the public schools.

18773 Of the common schools?—The arrangements are these: A certain number of hours a day, usually six, are set apart for secular instruction. It is recommended by a late Minute that the schools open and close with prayer. The acting on this recommendation is left to each local Board of school trustees to decide. This is not considered religious instruction, but a recognition of Christianity as the basis of the educational system. The arrangement for religious instruction as such, is fully explained in a Minute passed by the Council of Public Instruction in 1857, which I should like to read.

18774 Read it if you please?—I read from the report for the year 1857:—

"Minute adopted by the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada, on the 20th of April, 1857, and printed on the table over at each school register:

"Supplementary regulations with regard to religious instruction:—

"That in order to correct misapprehensions and diffuse more clearly the rights and duties of trustees over parties in regard to religious instruction in connection with the common schools, it is decided by the Council of Public Instruction, that the clergy of any persuasion, or their authorized representatives, shall have a right to give religious instruction to the pupils of their own church in each common school-house, at least once a week after the hour of four o'clock in the afternoon; and if the clergy of more than one persuasion apply to give religious instruction in the same school-house, the trustees shall decide on what day of the week the school-house shall be at the disposal of the clergyman of each persuasion at the time stated. But it shall be lawful for the trustees and clergymen to agree upon any other hour of the day at which each clergyman or his authorized representative may give religious instruction to the pupils of his own church, provided it be not during the regular hours of the school."

18775 Then do you distinguish between religious instruction which is there described as being to be given by the clergymen of each religious persuasion, and the form of opening the school business with prayer, which you described some time ago as being merely a kind of dedication of the Christian character of the school as the basis of the popular education?—I do so distinguish it; it is so understood.

18776 Then that form of prayer with which the school business commences at any commencement is in very general terms, I suppose, such as might be made use of by every denomination of Christians?—Yes; so it is said to be. The Chief Superintendent in one of his reports states that the prayers are taken from the common prayers in the prayer books of the Catholic and Protestant Churches.

18777 Are these schools opened to be attended by children of all forms of religious belief?—They are.

18778 Including, for example, Unitarians and Jews?—Including Unitarians and Jews.

18779 Is the making use of that form of prayer at the discretion of the Board of school trustees?—It is.

18780 It is frequently omitted?—Frequently omitted.

18781 In deference to the objections of certain classes who make use of the schools?—It is.

18782 What are those classes that object to the using of that common form of prayer?—I cannot speak from my own experience as to any objection to

it. I only know from the reports that it is not used in all schools.

18783 In the schools of which you had yourself the management there was no objection made, I take it?—There was no objection.

18784 Well, from your general acquaintance with Canada and the actual condition of the system of education in Canada, are you aware of the quarter from whence the objection to this form of prayer usually came, and in deference to whose objection it is frequently omitted?—I cannot say that I am aware; I presume that it would be in deference to the Catholic part of the community.

18785 But you are not yourself personally aware of it?—I am not.

18786 Then have you any information that you could give to the Commission with regard to the precise position which the Roman Catholic body in Canada West held with reference to that system of education?—Yes; they, under certain conditions, are allowed to have separate schools.

18787 Do you know if any portion of the Roman Catholic community in Canada West avail themselves of the ordinary common schools such as you have so far described?—Oh yes, they do largely avail themselves. I know from my own experience and from the reports.

18788 And consequently to a large extent the system of education which you have described to the committee is one really united?—It is.

18789 Then in the system of education as you have described it and as it exists generally throughout Canada, the schools are frequented by children of the different religious denominations, including Roman Catholics?—They are.

18790 Does that depend in any degree upon the relative proportion which the Roman Catholics bear to the population of the district?—I think it does in most cases.

18791 In what manner?—I hardly understand.

18792 You state that these common schools in Canada West are attended by children of various religious denominations, including the Roman Catholic?—Yes.

18793 And I ask does the attendance of the Roman Catholics in these schools depend in any degree upon the proportion which the Roman Catholic population bear to the general population of the locality, for instance, in a locality where the Roman Catholics form a large portion of the population do you find that they attend those schools in which united education exists?—In such a case it is quite possible that there would be a separate school, but I do not think that it is at all possible that all the Roman Catholic children would attend it.

18794 The Chairman.—Is it the habit of the Roman Catholics in Upper Canada to set up a school of their own whenever they have a sufficient number of children to form a school, or is it only in exceptional cases?—I should hardly say that it is either a habit or an exceptional case, I should rather say an exceptional case than a habit; that is, the schools that are set up and known as separate schools are few in proportion to all the schools in Upper Canada, and are few I should say in proportion to the Roman Catholic population.

18795 Mr. Sullivan.—Are there not large grants of Crown lands made for the support of the schools in Canada West?—Yes, grants.

18796 Most of those that are called Common schools are supported not upon the rates of the place but upon the Crown lands granted?—Do you say most of the Common schools?

18797 At least a large portion of the expense?—Not a large portion of the expense, a small proportion of the expense I should say.

18798 Would not the fact that these Crown lands have been set apart for Common schools interfere with the establishment of denominational schools?—I do not think I stated that there were denominational schools established.

18799. Would it not account for the absence of them?—It is not the fact that Crown land money is allocated to Common schools only.

18800. For Common schools?—This Crown land public money is allocated proportionately to the separate schools also.

18801. Would it be allocated in proportion to the different religious bodies?—No, it is allocated in proportion to that part of the religious body which separates.

18802. That separates?—The number who separate.

18803. And in separating would they get their share of the Crown lands?—They always do get their share of the public money in proportion to their school attendance.

18804. Do you say that from your knowledge of Canada West?—Yes, sir, I do.

18805. That in any town, where a portion of the people get up a separate school of their own for the purpose of having it under religious control, they get their relative share of the Crown grant and of the public grant?—They do; the Crown grant is the public grant.

18806. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—And with that stimulus, may I ask, is there a marked tendency towards setting up separate schools?—My experience in Canada is, that there is not a marked tendency towards setting up separate schools. I should like, with the permission of the Commission, to read part of the Separate School Act with regard to the allocation of the public grant.

18807. Sir Robert Kane.—Read it, if you please?—(Reads):—

"The trustees of each separate school shall, on or before the 30th day of June and the 31st day of December of each year, transmit to the Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada a correct return of the names of the children attending each school, together with the average attendance during the six preceding months, or during the number of months which have elapsed since the establishment thereof, and the number of months that it has been so kept open. And the Chief Superintendent shall thereupon determine the proportion which the trustees of each separate school are entitled to receive out of the Legislative grant, and shall pay over the amount thereof to such trustees. Provided always that the aggregate amount of the Legislative grant to separate schools in any one year shall not be greater than the aggregate amount contributed by rates, tax, or otherwise by the supporters of separate schools in the said year."

18808. Mr. Sullivan.—Separate must mean religious?—I should think not.

18809. Or does it mean different common schools?—Shall I define separate schools?

18810. If you please?—Originally, separate schools included schools for Protestants, for Roman Catholics, and for people of colour. I, perhaps, will explain it better by reading from the report. I am about to read an extract from the "General Regulations for the Organization, Government, and Discipline of Common Schools in Upper Canada," adopted after mature deliberation by the Council of Public Instruction, as authorized by the 13th and 14th Act of Victoria, chapter 68, section 58:—

"As Christianity is the basis of our whole system of elementary education, this principle shall pervade it throughout. Where it cannot be carried out in mixed schools to the satisfaction of both Roman Catholics and Protestants, the law provides for the establishment of separate schools."

The original provision with regard to separate schools is given in the Common School Act of 1850. It has afterwards been modified. It includes separate schools for Roman Catholics, Protestants, and coloured people. I read the provisions of the Act for the establishment of these schools:

"And be it enacted that it shall be the duty of the Municipal Council of any township, and of the Board of School Trustees of any city, town, or incorporated village, upon the application in writing of twelve or more resident householders, to authorize the establishment of one or more separate schools for Protestants, Roman Catholics, or coloured people, and in each case it shall prescribe the limits of the firmness of location for each school, and shall make the same provision for the holding of the first meeting for the election of trustees of each such separate school or schools as is provided in the 4th section of this Act, for holding the first school meeting of a new school section; provided always that each such separate school shall go into operation at the same time with alterations in school sections, and shall be under the same regulations as respect to the persons for whom such school is provided to be established as are common schools generally."

Now 22, 1868.  
John Gordon, cng.

18811. Master Brooks.—What is the date of that?—1860, 24th July.

18812. Sir Robert Kane.—You mentioned, if I recollect aright, that the Chief Superintendent of Education decided upon the proportion of the Crown-land funds that should be made applicable to the support of such a separate school in each case?—Yes.

18813. Now would it be possible to that Chief Superintendent of Education, in case he was a person holding opinions strongly opposed to separate schools, to make that division in such a way as to deprive the separate school of its fair means of support?—I should think not.

18814. Is he not accountable to the Legislature, and to the head of the Government?—He is.

18815. We may consider, therefore, that in his making the decision, he does it as a public officer, subject to public accountability?—Decidedly.

18816. You described the process by which the separate school is founded, a certain number of the ratepayers, heads of families, representing the necessity for such a school, and then a process being gone through of trustees being nominated, and a certain portion of funds raised by taxation for the support of the school?—Yes.

18817. Is it a fact that for the support of a separate school which is erected for the use exclusively of one religious denomination, the persons of that religious denomination wishing that their children should attend that school, must tax themselves for the funds necessary for its support?—They must.

18818. The general community is not taxed for the support of a separate school?—It is not.

18819. Then in fact where there is a double system of education of undenominational schools on the one hand, and denominational schools on the other, there is a co-ordinate double system of taxation, the community at large being taxed for the support of those schools which are available to all denominations, and those persons being specially taxed for the support of the schools which they require for their own special use?—That is so.

18820. Is that the statement of the case?—That is the statement of the case, with the limitation that those who separate are relieved from all tax for the public schools.

18821. In the case of such a school being founded there are trustees elected from amongst the persons who certify that they wish their children to attend that school and wish to have it established?—There are.

18822. Those trustees are elected from out of the ratepayers who tax themselves?—The ratepayers who separate.

18823. Who separate and who tax themselves for the support of the school?—Who are compelled to tax themselves for the support of the schools.

18824. Then the management and control of that separate school is vested in the tax-payers, just as much as the management and control of a mixed school is vested in the tax-payers?—Exactly.

18825. What position does the clergyman of that denomination, whether it be Protestant or Catholic, hold with regard to that separate school?—He is eligible to be elected trustee, and usually will be elected trustee. He has no higher position.

18826. To be elected one trustee?—One of the trustees.

18827. Is it necessary that there should be more than one trustee under the Act?—It is, three trustees in case of a separate school.

18828. Is a clergyman eligible to be appointed a trustee in the case of an ordinary common school?—Yes, he is.

18829. As much as as in the case of a separate school?—As much so.

18830. So that the relative positions of the laity and of the clergy are not different in the case of a

Nov 27, 1895. separate school from the case of a mixed school?—Not at all different.

John Gordon,  
Ct.

18831. In the case of the formation of a separate school in a district, does it follow usually that the children of that denomination are entirely withdrawn from the mixed school that they have previously attended?—From my own experience I know nothing of that. I should infer from the published reports that they are not always withdrawn.

18832. Have you ever known any case of very strong representations or very strong pressure being applied to force children to be withdrawn where their parents did not voluntarily do it?—I have not known it from my own experience at all.

18833. The persons who apply for the foundation of a separate school must give a strong practical evidence of their real anxiety for its establishment, by consenting to tax themselves?—They must.

18834. Have you had any experience with regard to the system of education in the United States?—A little experience. I have been in some of their schools. I have read their reports.

18835. In what regard does the system, as established in the United States, and particularly in the New England States, differ from the system you have described as regards Upper Canada?—It differs in two respects; in the one that there is no provision for religious instruction in the school room after school hours; in the other that there are no separate schools.

18836. Then you consider that in the Canadian system in the religious element is more fully recognized and is more fully carried out than in the system of the United States?—I do.

18837. Then you would not consider the Canadian system open to the charge which has been occasionally made by some persons against the American system, of being a purely secular system, without any recognition of religion?—I would not.

18838. Have you any experience or knowledge derived from documentary reading of the system of education pursued in Lower Canada—how far does it differ, if in any degree, from that pursued in Canada West?—I know something of it. The general principles of both systems I consider the same. There may be some difference in the working out.

18839. Is there the same provision for the maintenance of the system by local taxation?—There is.

18840. Is there the same provision for vesting the management and control of the schools in elected trustees?—There is, known in Lower Canada as School Commissioners.

18841. Is there a County Board of Education in Lower Canada, as in Upper Canada?—I cannot say as to that. I think not.

18842. Then in what body is the administration of the schools of Lower Canada vested?—It is vested in a central body analogous to the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada, with a Chief Superintendent of Education, analogous to the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada.

18843. There are, then, school sections, or districts in which there are elective school trustees, similar to those of Upper Canada?—There are.

18844. Then is it your opinion, from your knowledge of the subject, that there is no essential difference in principle, between the management of the school system in Lower Canada, where there is a preponderating Roman Catholic population, and that of Upper Canada, where the Roman Catholic population does not form the majority?—My opinion is that the management is similar.

18845. Is there a separate School Act for Lower Canada similar to that which you described for Upper Canada?—There is.

18846. Or does the same School Act apply to both provinces?—There is a Common School Act, and also a Separate School Act for Lower Canada, differing in some respects from the Separate School Act for Upper Canada.

18847. Can you state in what particulars it differs?

—I am not conversant with the Lower Canada Act—all its minute points of difference.

18848. Do you consider that there is any serious difference between the two?—I think not.

18849. Your attention has not been directed to the School Act of Lower Canada?—Not in the direction of the differences. I have rather thought of those points in which they agree.

18850. In what particulars do they agree?—In respect of providing for separate schools in Lower Canada similar to the separate schools in Upper Canada, known there as dissentient schools.

18851. Then, in the case of dissentient schools in Lower Canada, the same formalities are to be observed as to their foundation and as to their management, when founded, as in the case of separate schools in Upper Canada?—They are similar.

18852. Do you know whether in Lower Canada that privilege of founding a separate school has been more fully availed of by the Roman Catholic population than in Upper Canada?—The separate schools in Lower Canada would be rather for Protestants, I should say, than for Roman Catholics, although Roman Catholics have availed themselves of them.

18853. Then, in Lower Canada, owing to the preponderance of the Roman Catholics in the population, the management of the common schools would be, generally speaking, in Roman Catholic hands?—Yes.

18854. But would they still possess the character of being schools to be frequented by all religious denominations, and where the instruction would be of a non-denominational character?—They are of that character.

18855. And it is where a certain number of Protestants would feel themselves misrepresented in attending those non-denominational schools that they would then separate?—Yes.

18856. And apply for a dissentient school?—Yes.

18857. Have you, yourself, had occasion to see any of the Lower Canada schools?—I have never been in one of them.

18858. Then are you in a position to say on what grounds, generally speaking, the Protestant section of the community would have its demand for separate schools?—No, I am not in a position to say exactly on what grounds, but I should say on similar grounds to the grounds on which a Roman Catholic minority would ask for separate schools in Upper Canada—local misunderstandings.

18859. Do you mean by that to imply that it is not any interference with their religious belief—anything in the educational plan of the school that would induce them to secede?—I should think that the School Acts of both Provinces protect them against any interference in religious belief.

18860. Have you ever heard in your experience of the schools, whether in Lower or Upper Canada, of cases of interference or of attempted proselytism?—I never have heard of any case of the kind.

18861. It does not come forward as one of the topics of discussion in school affairs in Upper Canada?—It does not.

18862. On what, then, do you consider that the demand for a separate school is generally based?—Would you mean by "based," based in assigning a reason to the Government for asking for such a school?

18863. Yes?—No reason is asked. They are not expected to give a reason.

18864. That is to say, they are not expected to put forward any reason officially?—They are not.

18865. But as a matter of practical experience there must be some reason for a certain number of heads of families coming forward and demanding a liberty to tax themselves for the support of a separate school?—Well, this results in most cases from local misunderstanding.

18866. Personal quarrels?—Personal quarrels, and quarrels at the school Board.

18867. Among the trustees?—Among the trustees, when they happen to be of different religious faiths.

18868. And do you consider that those quarrels



would be independent of the great principles of religious liberty and of fair and equal treatment of the different religious denominations of the school?—I should think so. Perhaps I could illustrate.

18668. If you please?—In the last report which I have, which was issued before I left Canada, that for 1863, there are 120 separate schools, with 171 teachers, Roman Catholics, whereas in the public schools of Upper Canada there are a great many—504—Roman Catholic teachers.

18669. Do you know how many public schools there were in Upper Canada in that year?—Four thousand and thirteen common schools.

18671. What was the total number of teachers?—Five hundred and four Roman Catholic teachers.

18672. Do you recollect the total number of teachers?—Four thousand five hundred and four is the number of common school teachers.

18673. How long was that year, 1863, after the passing of the Separate School Act?—The first provision for separate schools was in 1841.

18674. Then was there an amended Separate School Act of a later date?—A number of amendments; three, I think.

18675. Do these amendments give any additional or greater facilities for the establishment of separate schools?—They are intended to do so.

18676. Then the Separate School Act, which gave the authority to found separate schools, was passed in 1841, and in 1843, twenty-two years subsequently, there have been established in Upper Canada 120 Roman Catholic separate schools?—Yes.

18677. Have there been any Protestant separate schools established in Upper Canada in that time?—There had been Protestant separate schools established, but I think that in 1863 there were none. They had all amalgamated with the common schools.

18678. In the common school, which is frequented by children of different religious denominations, is there any provision authoritatively made for the religion of the schoolmaster?—There is no provision made. It is understood that the trustees who are likely to be of the religion of the majority will appoint a teacher of the religion of the majority.

18679. Then in the common school, if there be a mixture of religions, for instance, if the school was two-thirds Protestant and one-third Roman Catholic as to the religion of the pupils, is there any provision for having a Roman Catholic teacher in that school?—There is no such provision. In fact the religious denomination of the pupils is not taken.

18680. Not recognised?—Not recognised.

18681. You mentioned that the number of teachers is considerably more than the number of schools?—About an eighth more.

18682. Then there is very frequently more than one teacher in a school?—Yes.

18683. Is there any arrangement with regard to the religious denomination of the second teacher, where there is a second?—None; no such arrangement.

18684. Then it might happen that you had a school where very nearly one-half of the children were Roman Catholic, but where the majority were Protestant, and you might leave the teaching of that school entirely in the hands of Protestants?—That is quite possible, and in such a case it is also possible that there would be a separate school resulting from what I have called misunderstandings.

18685. But is it not within the power of the local trustees to arrange to have each denomination represented in the masters of the schools?—It is; and it is frequently done; but there is no provision by law for it.

18686. I do not know whether I should be justified in relying upon a report made by the Rev. Mr. Bassar—are you aware that the Rev. J. Fraser made a report upon the school system of Canada and of the United States?—I am.

18687. I will ask you to read the paragraph of that report which I have marked?—(Reads).—

"The provisions applied equally to both sections of the united province, but as from the widely different circumstances of

the two cases they were not found equally applicable to both. In 1843 the amended Upper Canada School Act was passed, in which it was enacted 'that in all cases wherein the teacher of any school shall happen to be a Roman Catholic, the Trustees or school board shall be entitled to have a teacher of their own religious persuasion upon the application of ten or more resident freeholders or householders of any school district, or within the limits assigned to any town or city school. And in like manner when the teacher of any such school shall happen to be a Protestant, the Roman Catholic inhabitants shall have a separate school with a teacher of their own religious persuasion upon a like application. Each application was to be made in writing, signed with the names of the applicants, and delivered to the local superintendent, and was to contain the names of three persons who should be trustees of such separate school. And such school was to be entitled to receive its share of the public appropriation according to the number of children of that particular persuasion who should attend it, and was to be subject to visitation and the other regulations affecting common schools."

18688. Then in what you have read, power is given in every case where Roman Catholics are attending a school where the teacher is a Protestant to apply on that ground to have a separate school founded for themselves in which the teacher should be a Roman Catholic?—Yes, and that is the state of the law now.

18689. And does not that indicate a formal ground of separation which would be put forward in a demand for having a separate school?—It does; but this formal ground is not required by the separate school of 1853.

18690. Would not that demand for separate schools be to a considerable extent met by the arrangement which is so usual in this country, that if there were in a school a teacher and an assistant or two teachers, one of them would be of one denomination, and the other of the other?—Well, that would be recognising a principle that is not recognised in Upper Canada. It would be recognising a necessity for religious persuasion in a teacher in a common school.

18691. Then you consider that the Canadian principle is that the teacher is solely to occupy himself with secular instruction?—I do.

18692. And that, therefore, his particular religious belief lies only to his own conscience, and that the persons attending the school have nothing to do with it?—I do.

18693. Do you consider that a more practically desirable principle to all denominations than that which is acted upon in this country?—It seems to have worked well in Canada.

18694. The number of separate schools established in the course of the twenty-two years is but 120 out of 4,013?—Yes—if I used the phrase "established" it might not be, perhaps, accurate. There were more established, but some went back to the public schools again.

18695. Then do you say that instances have occurred where a separate school has been established at the request of certain inhabitants of the district, and that after some time they found it more desirable to abandon that separate school and to go back to the use of the common school?—Yes.

18696. Have you known instances of that?—I have known no instance. I merely take it from the published reports.

18697. But such a fact is stated in the published reports of the Department of Education?—Yes.

18698. Do your observations in regard to the Canadian system apply to male and to female schools?—They do.

18699. Is there an arrangement for a Sunday school system for religious teaching in Canada?—There is no Government arrangement.

18700. Is there a system of Sunday school teaching carried out by the masters of religion in the parts of Canada with which you are acquainted?—Yes.

18701. Is that considered as usefully supplying or supplementing the religious education given in the common school?—I should say that it is.

18702. Is it popularly regarded as an element in the religious education of the people?—It is regarded as a necessary element, but with which the State has nothing to do.

18703. In the school system of the United States,

Nov. 27, 1868.

John Gordon,  
esq.

Nov. 27, 1886.  
John Gordon,  
esq.

where the schools are practically secular, the Sunday school system is considered to be very important as supplying religious instruction—is not that the fact?—It is, that is the fact.

18904. Is it considered of the same importance in the Canadian system?—I should think quite so.

18905. Then in Canada the religious element in education is supplied, if I understand you right, by certain hours and days in the week being appropriated by the school trustees for religious instruction?—Yes.

18906. Not interfering with the secular instruction of the school, and then also on Sundays religious education is given under arrangements that are purely voluntary, but which still are considered as supplementing, in an important degree, the religious education given at the school?—Yes.

18907. Then, on the whole, you consider that the religious element of education is satisfactorily supplied in Canada?—I should think so.

18908. Have you found, from your experience in Canada, the different classes of the population living harmoniously together?—That has been my whole experience.

18909. Do religious feuds or religious differences exist there with such intensity as to endanger the peace or the social concord of the district?—I have never heard of any religious discussions causing disturbance of the peace.

18910. Do you consider that the united school system has any advantages over the separate school system in promoting that social concord and harmony amongst the classes of the population who belong to different religious creeds?—I should like to modify my answer by knowing in how far you apply the separate school system to only one denomination or to many.

18911. If you consider the school system fully developed, so as to have the Roman Catholic population educated exclusively in one class of schools under Roman Catholic management, and the Protestant portion of the population similarly educated in separate schools under exclusively Protestant management, whether would you consider such a system more conducive to the social harmony and tranquillity of a population, or a system of common schools, where all denominations would meet for secular instruction upon terms of perfect equality?—I can best answer that question by giving my own experience. In the latter of the two towns in which I resided, Port Hope, I had charge of the education in the town for nine years; I led of course pupils from the various religious denominations, including not only Roman Catholics and Protestants, in the ordinary sense of the word "Protestants," but including also the phases of Protestantism that may be found in Canada or the United States; and almost all these various denominations were represented on the school Board as school trustees; and yet I never knew of a religious discussion or a religious discussion at the school Board. I myself was secretary, and attended the meetings, and I should have heard them had they been brought up. I had all the children of the town attending those schools, and none were withdrawn from them in consequence of any suspicion that their faith would be interfered with. That is my own experience.

18912. Have you reason to believe that your personal experience is that regard may be taken to represent the state of things generally throughout the country?—I think it may.

18913. The *Conférence*.—What were your duties with respect to the common schools that were under your charge in West Canada?—The common schools were combined with the grammar school in the same building, with the addition of two primary schools to prepare for the next higher classes in the grammar school. I had charge of the whole—and charge of the arrangements with regard to teaching and examining the pupils, in all respects I acted similarly somewhat to what an Inspector would have done with regard to the common schools.

18914. Had you anything to do with the appoint-

ment or dismissal of any of the teachers of the common schools?—Not directly; I was consulted, and no teacher would be appointed without my approval.

18915. Were the masters of the common schools subject to your instructions and suggestions?—They were, directly.

18916. What was the pay of the common school-masters in your schools?—It ranged from \$700 to about \$900, and perhaps the very lowest \$500 in rural districts, \$5 making £1 sterling; \$700 the highest to \$250 the lowest for male teachers.

18917. Do the children of these common schools all pay school fees?—No, there are many free schools.

18918. What was the ordinary fee of the highest class who paid?—The School Act limits the fee to a quarter dollar a month, which is a shilling a month, for the highest; and no fees are ever charged lower than six pence a month.

18919. Had you anything analogous to the Irish system of monitors or pupil-teachers?—Nothing.

18920. Was the teaching entirely conducted by adult teachers?—It was.

18921. What was the size of each of the common schools under you—how many boys in them?—The boys' schools ranged from about fifty to fifty.

18922. How many teachers would there be for that number?—I don't know whether I am questioned just now about the common schools with separate buildings, and in a separate place, or a common school department in a large school. I will speak of the common school in a separate building, very few of these common schools in separate buildings and in rural sections, are separate for boys and girls; they are mixed schools as to sexes, therefore I could hardly be able to give an example of fifty boys, but fifty of a mixed attendance of boys and girls would be under one master.

18923. What was the general practice of the common schools under your charge as to beginning and concluding with prayers?—We used the form of prayer simply at the opening and closing of the school.

18924. Did the Roman Catholics object to join in those prayers?—They never objected, but they had the privilege of remaining outside until the prayers were over.

18925. Did they usually avail themselves of that?—Not always.

18926. Were there any other schools whose children used to absent themselves from the prayers?—None whatever.

18927. Did the clergy give religious instruction in the schools?—They did not.

18928. Did they confine themselves entirely to Sunday school teaching?—They did.

18929. Was any portion of a week day set apart for religious instruction, or is the custom in Ireland?—No portion of a week day was so set apart.

18930. Did the schools meet five days in the week?—They met on five days only; on school on Saturday.

18931. When any independent supported and established a school of their own, did they pay the ordinary school rate in addition?—They did not; they were exempted from the ordinary school rate.

18932. Mr. Gibson.—Were there any restrictions on the use of school-rooms after school hours for religious instruction?—No.

18933. Was there any restriction with respect to the kind of use might be made of school-houses—at whose disposal are the school-houses?—At the disposal of the local authorities, the trustees who built them.

18934. Rev. Dr. Hales.—You have already referred to the United States system of education. I have written to a gentleman whom I met in the States of America, and who is now a professor of a college in this country, and he has given me very briefly the following statement. I shall ask you if you concur in the account given by him. Are the city and country districts divided into school districts on the basis of the population?—Yes.

18935. He also adds, in these districts altogether education is at the expense of the State, a fund being raised by a school tax; is that right?—I should not

say at the expense of the State; I should say a local school tax at the expense of the people.

18938. Do you concur in this statement; the school of the district is managed by the directors of said district, who have the choice of a teacher?—Yes.

18937. And that these directors in their management are governed by the school laws of the State?—Yes.

18938. And that the teacher must undergo an examination by the State Inspector as a condition of his appointment?—Yes.

18939. There are, I believe, also normal or training schools in the States of America?—Yes.

18940. Is there any such arrangement with regard to religious instruction by clergymen as we have in Ireland. In other words are the clergymen of the different denominations allowed to teach religion on the premises?—I cannot speak of the normal schools from my own knowledge as to that fact, but I would infer from what is done in the common schools that they are not.

18941. My question refers to the common schools?—They are not.

18942. No minister of any denomination is allowed to give religious instruction on the premises?—No.

18943. And how each State its primary school, grammar school, and high school graduated and conducted on the same principle?—Yes, I should hardly extend my reply to each State, for there are some States of which I know nothing, and each State legislates for itself in school matters.

18944. But does this principle hold that every child in a State can have the benefit of some measure of education without direct cost, while the tax by which the whole fabric is supported falls lightly on each individual father of a family or head of a household?—Yes.

18945. A gentleman of experience has lately returned from the States of America, and having examined into the school system, he gives the following brief description. I will ask you to speak with regard to it. He says—"The United States and Canada furnish the following particulars relative to the American system of National education and the manner of dealing with the religious question. The religious difficulty has heretofore stood in the way of the National system of education here." He refers specially to England and Scotland. "The Americans have partially got over that difficulty in the way as open to us as to them. Their position is this—that public money appropriated for public education cannot justly be expended on an education which is not public but sectarian. If half the people are Roman Catholics and half Protestants, it is unjust to take Protestant money to build Roman Catholic schools, and equally unjust to take Roman Catholic money to build Protestant schools; but if Protestants and Catholics are both agreed that it is desirable to have their children taught to read, write, and cipher, here is a kind of education which, being desired by the whole country, may be justly paid for out of the public funds. On this position the system of public schools in America is based, which is putting the masses of her people so far in advance of ours in point of education. To say that religion shall not be taught in these schools, is not to say that religion is less important than writing or ciphering, but simply that the public are not one on the subject of reading, writing, and ciphering, while they are at variance on the subject of religion." May I ask does that entirely express your views as to the United States school system?—It does, but I could give modifications with regard to that as regards Canada.

18946. Now, in connection with the Canadian schools you have been describing, should you say the schools belong to the people or to individual managers in any sense?—I should say they belong to the people.

18947. And not to individual managers, lay or clerical?—And not to the managers, lay or clerical.

18948. On what ground do you make that statement?—On the ground that the people are privileged by law, but not compelled by law to tax themselves for the establishing and for the maintenance of the schools.

18949. Through the representatives of the people you have been describing to us in Canada, what instruction are these teachers expected to give?—Secular instruction only.

18950. Is there no facility afforded to the clergy of the different denominations, or any parties representing them, to give religious instruction in the school-rooms?—Yes, by the minutes of 1857, already referred to by me.

18951. To the children of their own communion?—Yes.

18952. Is that during school hours?—Out of school hours.

18953. Never during school hours?—Never during school hours.

18954. Have we any schools in this country analogous to these schools you have been describing in Canada?—I am not quite sure, if I know beforehand that in the model schools religious instruction is given out of school hours, they would be analogous.

18955. You have already told us that the Roman Catholic parents who wish it are permitted to establish separate schools for their children?—Yes.

18956. Are they then relieved from the tax for the public school?—They are.

18957. You have also told us that Protestants have similar advantages—do the Protestants avail themselves of their privilege in that respect?—Not now, in Upper Canada.

18958. Have they ceased altogether in Upper Canada to avail themselves of it?—They have.

18959. Now in a separate Roman Catholic school of which you speak, is there any facility given for religious instruction to children other than Roman Catholics?—No.

18960. Now with regard to this religious instruction in separate schools for Roman Catholic children, at what time must that instruction be commenced?—Out of school hours.

18961. Is that invariably the case?—That is my impression.

18962. Then, I presume, to a very large extent those schools correspond to our non-vested schools in this country?—Yes.

18963. Are there any schools in Upper Canada denominational in the sense in which that word is used in this country?—What is that sense?

18964. That sense is this, that parties are permitted by law or rule to give religious instruction when they please?—There are no such schools in Upper Canada.

18965. You have already told us the parties decide whether the teachers shall, in each case, open or close the business of the day with any religious service—who are the parties who decide in each case?—The school trustees, with the consent of the teacher.

18966. Whom do you regard those trustees as representing?—They represent the people who build the school, maintain it, and send their children to it.

18967. Are the opening exercises regarded as anything but devotional—are they regarded as in anywise giving religious instruction?—No, they are not.

18968. With regard to the separate schools, are the Roman Catholic portion of the population allowed to support a public or a separate school just as they please?—Yes, that requires limitations.

18969. When I say the Roman Catholic portion of the population I speak of them altogether?—Individually they are allowed to support or not to support as they please.

18970. But no Roman Catholic is bound to support a separate or Roman Catholic school as a matter of necessity?—No.

18971. Though his own co-religionists of the municipality may have thought it right to establish such a school?—Exactly.

18972. Now, in what respect does the management of schools in Upper Canada differ from the management of schools in this country?—I have already partially referred to that. They differ in that way. The management of schools in this country is in the hands of individuals, almost always. In Upper

No. 27, 1869.  
John Gordon,  
sq.

Feb. 22, 1888. Canada it is always in the hands of a Corporation, who strictly represent the people as their elected representatives, and are responsible to them for the management.

18973. From your own experience of both, may I ask which you would prefer?—Well, I may have Canadian prejudices, but I like the management as it is in Upper Canada.

18974. On what ground?—On the ground that the teachers should be responsible to the people who employ them, and to whom they are tendering service, and not to any individual.

18975. What is the principle on which the public or separate schools are allowed by the State, keeping in view the average half yearly attendance in each school?—The Legislative grant is first apportioned comparatively between the separate schools and the common schools on the aggregate attendance at these schools. It is then apportioned to the individual schools on the average yearly attendance.

18976. In order to obtain such a grant, must any sum be raised by local taxation?—Yes.

18977. What amount?—It is necessary that in the case of each school an amount equal to the amount of the Legislative grant be raised by local taxation.

18978. Is there any condition on which this is made, viewed in the relation of the schools to the State?—Yes.

18979. What is that condition?—They are subject to all the regulations made by the Council of Public Instruction—regulations which are made according to law.

18980. Does that apply to both the public and separate schools to which you have referred?—It does.

18981. Will you mention that condition specifically?—I refer to the religious element?—Simply that the religious exercises shall not interfere with the general exercises in the school.

18982. How does that operate. In other words, can distinct religious instruction be communicated during the hours for secular teaching in either the separate or common schools?—It is not so intended by the School laws.

18983. Are there any qualifications for a teacher insisted upon. Must each teacher be properly qualified?—All teachers must be qualified. The common school teacher must be qualified in the mode I have already expressed. The separate school teachers are qualified differently.

18984. But with regard to the public schools?—The teachers must be qualified.

18985. Must each teacher hold a certificate of qualification?—Yes.

18986. From what source does he obtain it?—From a constituted Board of examination.

18987. Has that constituted Board of examination any connexion with the local school managers, or is it an independent body?—It is an independent body.

18988. You were about to supplement your answer by a statement with regard to separate schools. Now, is this rule necessary in the case of teachers of separate schools?—No.

18989. What is their position?—Their position is this. A certificate from the local trustees who appoint them, or from Lower Canada, is sufficient to draw the Legislative grant.

18990. What brought about this exception?—There are two assumed reasons, I shall not say they are the correct ones. But what are supposed to be the reasons, are these?—One is that it was rather inconvenient sometimes to bring the authorities of common schools and the authorities of separate schools into contact at all, even in the way of granting certificates. Another reason suggested is that it meets the exceptional cases of schools under religious orders who did not care to submit themselves to examination for certificates.

18991. Your attention has been turned to the Rev. Mr. Fraser's report. Does he not speak of the general state of inefficiency of these separate schools?—He does.

18992. Do parties issue any connexion between the absence of the proper certificate, and the state of inefficiency of these schools referred to by the Rev.

Mr. Fraser?—I think it is natural there should be some connexion.

18993. Would this to a large extent apply. I quote from the report, page 357, of the Rev. J. Fraser.—“The separate schools are working great injury to those who adopt them as well as to their neighbours. They disseminate no instruction worth the name of education, and would appear, in some instances at least, to be established as a means of evading the expense of supporting a properly conducted school.”—The former part of that statement I must answer from experience.

18994. The Chairman.—How can a separate school be the cheapest?—It is made the cheapest simply by cheap teachers being hired. I would not say that this applies to all the separate schools. It must be a general statement.

18995. Rev. Dr. Benson.—You have already told us that in 1863 there were 4,013 common schools in Upper Canada, and only 120 separate or Roman Catholic schools; could you give us, in accordance with the Census, the proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants of all denominations at that time?—Not exactly. I can give the Census of 1851, if it will be taken.

18996. Is there no later?—I have no later Census of the distinction between the denominations.

18997. Could you give us any information as to the amount of the Legislative grant to the common schools in 1863?—158,073 dollars.

18998. That would be about £51,414?—Yes.

18999. Now, what was the amount to separate schools?—8,075 dollars, or about £1,615.

19000. Could you give us the total amount from all sources in support of the common schools of the country for that year?—The common schools, 1,432,885 dollars.

19001. Or about £286,577?—Yes.

19002. What was the total amount from all sources to separate schools?—33,869 dollars.

19003. Or about £—£5,761.

19004. Now, what was the proportion of local support raised for common schools in proportion to the whole amount expended?—Is it raised locally by the people themselves?

19005. Yes?—For that year they raised seven-eighths of the whole amount expended for the common schools.

19006. What was the proportion of local support or sums raised by the people in aid of the separate schools?—They raised about three-fourths of the whole.

19007. Now, what seems to be the proportion as to the liberality of the people who support the common schools, and those who support the separate schools?—Well, based on that statement, it would appear that the supporters of the common schools relatively raise double the amount.

19008. With regard to the balance for the separate schools, the remaining one-fourth expended?—It is given by the Government.

19009. What is the proportion of the school population at the separate schools?—In the ratio of about one-twentieth to the separate schools, and nineteen-twentieths to the common schools.

19010. What is the proportion of the population Roman Catholic?—Of the population attending the separate schools?

19011. Yes?—About one twenty-fourth of the whole attend the separate schools. I can give the statistics.

19012. Please furnish the statistics?—The whole number of pupils attending the common schools for the year 1863, was 340,808 pupils, the whole number attending the separate schools was 14,900, being less than one twenty-fourth of the whole school attendance.

19013. Three-fourths of the Roman Catholic children would seem to prefer remaining at common schools?—Which three-fourths? I have not given the whole Roman Catholic population.

19014. You refer to schools?—Yes.

19015. What is the proportion of separate schools?

—The separate schools being 120 in all, and the other schools being 4,013. Thirty-three times as many common schools as separate schools.

19016. Can you give me the number of teachers altogether, who are engaged in these separate schools? —One hundred and seventy-one in Upper Canada.

19017. What was the number belonging to religious orders?—Fifty-two in 1863, I speak of 1863.

19018. What was the number of lay teachers in these separate schools?—One hundred and nineteen.

19019. Now, in the same year what was the number of Roman Catholic teachers in the public schools? —Five hundred and four.

19020. The Rev. Mr. Fraser has said, in his report, that the clergy of the different denominations hold aloof from the common school system. What is your opinion with regard to that, from your experience?—I consider that a mistake. My experience is very different indeed. My local experience in the town in which I lived warrants a very opposite opinion.

19021. Can you confirm the result of your own experience by a reference to any official statement?—Yes. It appears from the report of 1863 that there were 341 Local Superintendents in Upper Canada. I have already explained that Local Superintendent means Local Inspector of schools, of whom 151 were clergymen of the various denominations.

19022. They seem to be nearly equal in number to the laymen who occupied a similar position?—Almost.

19023. Do these belong to the different denominations in the country?—They do. I shall give the denominations if you wish.

19024. If you please?—Church of England, Church of Rome, Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, and not ascertained.

19025. Mr. Stokes—Can you give the numbers?—Yes, I can give the numbers. Church of England, 35; Church of Rome, 4; Presbyterians, 65; Baptists, 8; Congregationalists, 2; Methodists, 27; not ascertained, 10.

19026. Rev. Dr. Wilson—May I ask you if you have seen Mr. J. F. Maguire's "Irish in America"?—I have.

19027. What is his opinion of this system which you have been describing?—I can give you his opinion. Shall I read an extract from his work?

19028. Read the extract?—"The educational system of Upper Canada is in every way calculated to develop the intelligence and stimulate the energy of the rising youth of the country. The teaching is practical and comprehensive, and the administration appears to be, as far as I could ascertain, just and impartial."

19029. Has it been regarded by others as one of the best systems of education to be met with?—Yes. May I read an extract from a periodical?

19030. What is the periodical?—*The Month*.

19031. Read it?—

"One of the foremost systems of education, as, it would seem, in the world, is to be found in operation, under the Government of the British Crown, in the 'Dominion of Canada.' The Canadian system owes its freedom to the wise and enlightened policy of the Colonial Government, happily unshackled by any jealousy at home."

19032. What does that periodical represent?—I think the English Roman Catholics.

19033. Mr. Stokes—What is the date of the number from which you quote?—March, 1868.

19034. Rev. Mr. Cowie—If the state of feeling in Canada is very harmonious between the different religious bodies, how can the example of Canada be very beneficial to us in dealing with the Irish question?—I cannot answer that question.

19035. It appears from what you have said that the feeling in Canada is considerably different from what it is in Ireland about the question of education. Do you think that?—I do, indeed.

19036. And however much it might be desirable we should have that harmony of feeling, we can hardly count upon having it here at present?—Does your experience of Galway and Tralee lead you to the conclusion that there is any likelihood of agreement between the different religious bodies?—Perhaps not, but under

the Canadian system, the school management in Galway and Tralee must be in the hands of the majority.

19037. They are at present you mean in the hands of the majority?—They would be under these circumstances. There would be no more ground for difference here than in Canada.

19038. Do people in Canada care to any great extent about separate religious instruction for their children?—Undoubtedly they do.

19039. You say these separate schools were not set up as a rule from any religious differences?—Yes. Perhaps I was misunderstood. I think I put the answer wrongly. I should say the misunderstandings locally would result from religious misunderstandings in the management of financial matters.

19040. Will you explain that a little more, please?—That those differences of opinion which would result in setting up a separate school, would likely be caused by financial misunderstandings between the religious bodies if they were about equally balanced.

19041. Are people ready in different proportions according to their religious opinions?—Not at all. But if, in a Municipality, there were a large number of a different denomination from the majority, they would expect, of course, to have a teacher of their own persuasion appointed to one school, as is natural. Perhaps that would not always be done. Misunderstandings might result as they have done in Canada.

19042. You said they would like to have a teacher of their own persuasion appointed to one school?—Yes, they might.

19043. Does not that show a preference for separate religious instruction?—No, it need not.

19044. Or do you think that it is merely a case of a question of patronage?—A question of patronage? I should say nothing more—for the school boards, both in separate and common schools, are not to be derided of all, any part of them, to religious instruction.

19045. Rev. Dr. Wilson—In fact the law specially provides accordingly?—Yes.

19046. Mr. Stokes—A passage was read to you by Dr. Wilson, purporting to be from the report of the Rev. J. Fraser, in condemnation of separate schools. Will you be so good as to look at the passage, and see whether it is not merely an expression of opinion of a Local Superintendent quoted by the Rev. Mr. Fraser?—It is.

19047. Will you read the passage immediately following?—Yes.

"I have visited the separate schools this year, and found them to compare well with our common schools, but I am sorry to say I cannot speak enthusiastically of the progress of the schools in these respects."

19048. Therefore the comparative merits of the two systems of schools is matter of opinion?—It may be. Mr. Fraser also in his report speaks of the inefficiency of the separate schools.

19049. Are there any training schools in Upper or Lower Canada?—There are.

19050. Are the students in training school as separate as to religion?—In Upper Canada they are mixed, in Lower Canada they are, I believe, separate.

19051. How are those training schools managed as to the superintendence, moral and religious education, and the intellectual?—I cannot speak of the Lower Canada training schools at all, nor do I know much of the management of the others.

19052. From what funds are these training schools supported?—From State funds.

19053. From State funds entirely?—I should say so.

19054. Under what conditions may separate schools be founded in Canada?—The last provision is the Act of 1863.

19055. Must one of the conditions be, that the teacher of a common school is not of the same religion as those who wish to set up the separate school?—I think not now. Not according to the late Act.

19056. May any ten families who desire it set up a separate school?—Any five who desire it may, if they are Roman Catholics.

Nov. 25, 1868.  
John Gordon,  
esq.

Nov. 27, 1865.  
John Gordon,  
Esq.

19057. And in Lower Canada, if Protestant?—Yes, I am speaking of Upper Canada just now, as I know it best.

19058. Which of the main creeds are represented amongst the people of Upper Canada?—Taking the census of 1851, as giving the various groups, we have the Church of England, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, &c.

19059. Which of these religious divisions approve of the common school system?—Well, I can hardly speak by denominations in answering that question, I should say the Protestant denominations approve, and the majority—judging from the reports—of the Roman Catholic denomination.

19060. Are not the common schools condemned most emphatically by the Roman Catholic bishops?—They are.

19061. Have you ever heard or seen language such as this proceeding from a Roman Catholic bishop: "Catholic clerics in this country who do not use their clerical power in behalf of separate schools are guilty of mortal sin, likewise parents who do not make the sacrifice necessary to procure such schools, or who send their children to mixed schools. Moreover, the confessor who would give absolution to such parents, electors, or legislators in support mixed schools, to the prejudice of separate schools would be guilty of mortal sin?"—Yes.

19062. Is there not a standing quarrel between the Episcopal clergy and the Superintendents of the common schools?—Not now.

19063. Is your experience more recent than that of the Rev. Mr. Fraser?—Yes, in that particular point, I have the newspaper experience of the early part of this year.

19064. Do you say that the clergy, represented by Mr. Fraser as condemning utterly the common schools, are now reconciled to them?—I think Mr. Fraser does not condemn the clergymen.

19065. What does he say, please?—"I call it a quarrel, and I hardly think I have made too strong a word. I have before me seven letters on the non-religious common school system of Canada and the United States, by Adam Townley, Presbyterian of the [diocese of Toronto, 1853, in which the Chief Superintendent's Report for 1851 is called 'an insult to the ministry of all denominations in the province,' and 'a denunciation before the public of those ministers, and that very numerous and intelligent portion of the lay community who venture to differ from his most unimpeachable doctrines,' and he is called upon 'henceforth to fight his battle with those who desire denominational schools on honest grounds?'" Adam Townley wrote that, in 1853, and I think that that paper of Adam Townley's is not a correct expression of the opinion of the majority of the clergy men of the Church of England, even at the time; and I am able further, to give evidence of the present year against that. I may just state generally that the present Archbishop, Fuller, of the diocese of Toronto, Archbishop of Niagara, was the leading opponent of the common school system of Upper Canada. He has lately become a member of the Council of Public Instruction, and has expounded himself publicly, by letter, in the Canadian newspapers, that he has changed his mind in regard to the public schools. Mr. Fraser himself says in a foot note, at page 181, "I think that neither 'England' nor the Church would accept the Presbyterian of the diocese of Toronto as an exponent of their views."

19066. You have said that the minute of 1857 gives the clergy of different denominations the right of access to the schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction. Can you say if the clergy ever avail themselves of the right so given?— seldom, they have availed themselves in isolated instances.

19067. These instances are very exceptional?—Very exceptional. There are some three instances.

19068. Do you regard the Canadian system as a purely secular system?—I do not. It is purely secular as far as State support goes, but it encourages religious instruction by the proper authorities.

19069. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Does the State pay for it?—It does not.

19070. Mr. Stokes—Dr. Gwynne is Head Superintendent?—Yes.

19071. In his report for 1857, as quoted by the Rev. Mr. Fraser, he says—"In not one of the cities or towns of Upper Canada were there religious exercises or the reading of the Scriptures." Do you consider a system under which, in not one of the schools there is religious exercise, or reading the Bible, to be a religious system?—I should say it is the first instance that was not true, in 1857, when I was in Canada.

19072. Do you agree with this statement, made by Mr. Fraser himself—"What is called the 'religious difficulty' only emerges where the population is divided between Catholics and Protestants, and where the children in the school are mixed in a similar way. In such cases, we have found almost everywhere else, religious instruction goes to the wall. The scrupulousness both of parents and of officers on the point are so keen that, to avoid offence, that branch of the teaching is abandoned altogether!"—I think Mr. Fraser misunderstood the Canadian system when he spoke as he does there—he presumes, I think, that the State pays for religious instruction. Quite the contrary; and to say that religious instruction goes to the wall because it is not taught in the schools during school hours, is, at least, untrue to the clergy and Sabbath school teachers, whose duty it is to give religious instruction to the children of the people.

19073. The statement is not that no religious instruction is given to the children, but simply that it is not given in the schools?—Just so. I say he has mistaken the broad principle upon which the State aid is given to the schools.

19074. Do you concur in this statement?—"Unhappily there seems to be no middle course between a purely secular system and a purely denominational one. All expedients that have been devised—all compromises that have been advocated appear to me either to result in nothing, or conformably to break down. What is called the 'religious' instruction given under the American and Canadian system is so faint a tincture as hardly to deserve being called religious instruction at all—it is merely a devotional exercise at the opening and closing of the school?"—No, I do not, and for this reason, that I think there again he is speaking of a State secular system, or a State religious system. He is simply implying, all through, that religious instruction is to be given by the State.

19075. Supposing the Canadian system or something analogous to it, to be introduced into Ireland, with a power given to five families to separate themselves and establish an independent school of their own religion—do you think that any children at all would attend the common schools?—I do. I take Galway as an example, my own district; and if that system was adopted there, I believe the common schools would remain in the hands of the majority. They would appoint their own teachers, distribute their own funds, and why should not these schools in Galway belong to the public system as Catholic schools. Perhaps the Protestants might separate; or many of them might remain by the National schools as they do now.

19076. Would you give to the majority the right not only of appointing the teachers, but of arranging the course of studies to meet their own views?—I would not. The course of studies is arranged for us Canada by the Council of Instruction. That is arranged by law.

19077. But you would give them the power to appoint their own teachers?—Yes.

19078. How would a system arranged in that way differ from the existing system of non-voted schools?—In this way. The existing system in the non-voted schools implies that the teacher within the school hours gives religious instruction to the children, and is responsible to the State for that, instead of to the clergy.

19079. Is not that a matter left to the patrons of

the schools?—My own private opinion is that it is not; in that respect I may differ from others.

19080. Do I understand you to believe it to be of obligation that religious instruction should be given in a non-sectarian school during ordinary school hours?—That is what I mean, and I take that from the fact that "school hours," by the Commissioners' rules, means all the time from the opening to the closing of the school, and therefore includes the time for religious instruction.

19081. Mr. Gibson.—You are aware, I presume, that from the opening of the school to the close of it there is a period for united secular, and for separate religious instruction?—Of course; but the separate religious instruction is part of the teacher's duty.

19082. Mr. Stobo.—Are you of opinion that there would be any violation of the rules of the Board in a school in which by the parent's desire no religious instruction was given at all?—I think not, but I think he may desire it to be given if he pleases. That is what makes the difference.

19083. Lord Gladbrook.—When a school is about to be set up in Upper Canada is there any defined area for it, or any district assigned to it, or do the parties interested in it meet together and define the limits of the locality for it themselves?—There are defined limits.

19084. Who defines the limits?—The law defines them. The whole of Upper Canada is divided into what are called "School sections."

19085. And must there be a school in each of those sections?—Two or more may be united.

19086. Is it compulsory upon the inhabitants to have a school for each section?—It is not compulsory. There are sections in Upper Canada now where there are no schools established according to law.

19087. Then it is not compulsory?—No, it is not.

19088. It is according to the wishes of the people in the particular district whether they will have a school or not?—It is.

19089. Do they build the school entirely from their own funds, or do they get assistance for building it from the Government?—They build it entirely from their own funds.

19090. They are not assisted by contributions from any general or building fund?—They are not.

19091. But for carrying on the school and procuring of school requisites they raise a rate year by year, and what is raised is supplemented by an equal sum from the Government fund?—Not exactly. There is a minimum rate which they must raise. There is a certain amount of money allocated for common school purposes. This is allocated amongst the municipalities. They must raise by local rate at least an equal amount, but they may raise as much above that as they please.

19092. And does the State grant increase in proportion as the local rate increases?—No; the locality must raise the minimum amount, and that is all that is required by law.

19093. The Government grant is the same whatever sum they raise?—It is.

19094. What does the Government grant depend upon?—It is first divided according to the population of the municipalities, each of which contain a number of school sections, and the gross amount allocated to any one municipality is then subdivided amongst the school sections within its limits, according to their average attendance.

19095. Then the amount of the grant depends upon population?—Upon population.

19096. And not upon the attendance or results of the schools?—It depends upon the average attendance to the extent in the municipality of the sub-division given to each school, which very often includes twenty schools or more.

19097. Then in a municipality that may contain twenty sections, there is not a rate separately for each school, but the rating is for all?—The rating is by municipalities, not by school sections.

19098. And the local boards administer those funds

and send them out to separate schools according to what such is to get?—Yes.

19099. What is the smallest number that would be allowed to withdraw themselves from the common school and start a separate or denominational school?—In Upper Canada five families, and in Lower Canada, I think, twenty children.

19100. In Upper Canada is that limit of five families irrespective of the number of children there may be comprised in each family?—Yes.

19101. And though there may be but one child in each family?—Yes.

19102. And they may set up a separate school for themselves?—They may.

19103. You say that these schools—the separate schools are hardly ever set up on account of religious differences, but generally because of some local misunderstanding or disagreement as to the application of funds?—Yes; perhaps in some cases it is thought convenient to have religious instruction given at the close of the day by the teacher, and that I fancy is common in the separate schools, but is never done in the common school.

19104. I suppose the children attending these separate schools are all of one denomination?—Yes. But allow me to modify that answer "Yes." It is necessary to mention that in Canada it is only Protestants or Roman Catholics who can have these separate schools. Methodists, or other dissenting people, cannot, as such, separate—the term Protestant is taken in its broad sense as distinguished from Roman Catholic. No Church of England people can separate themselves, or Presbyterians, or Methodists. The separatists must separate simply as Protestants.

19105. Protestant or Roman Catholic?—And in Upper Canada, of course, Roman Catholics.

19106. Then the separation can only be on the broad sense of Protestants or Roman Catholics?—On that broad sense.

19107. The Chairman.—Do you mean that amongst the twenty children in Lower Canada there should be an actual admixture of denominations?—No; I mean this—that there is no provision for schools analogous to what may be called the Roman Catholic separate school. But if Protestants of different denominations happen to be mixed together, they must combine as dissentients in dissentient schools, and therefore the schools cannot be denominational.

19108. Lord Gladbrook.—Might not in these schools the children be all of one denomination, and if so, are they not permitted to have religious instruction how and when they please?—No; I think not—they are permitted to have it "how" they please, but not "when" they please.

19109. The same rules, with respect to religious education, then obtain in both the common schools and separate schools?—As far as I understand the subject they do.

19110. How are these separate schools off on the point of expense. They must, of course, cost the rate-payers individually much more money than the common schools, which have much larger numbers?—That is, they must cost more to the individuals who support them.

19111. They are a greater tax on the individuals who start them, than upon the supporters of the common schools?—Yes; but there is this limitation to be given in connexion with that, that not only those who withdraw are allowed to tax themselves for the support of such separate schools, but all others who call themselves supporters of the Catholic schools, being Roman Catholics, although they have no children themselves, may pay their taxes into the separate school fund rather than into the common school fund.

19112. Even though they don't make use of the school?—Everybody is taxed whether they have children or not.

19113. Of course the whole community may join themselves to either a common school or a separate school?—The whole Roman Catholic community.

19114. You say you have known cases where, after

Nov. 27, 1868.

John Gordon,  
esq.

Nov. 27, 1846.  
John Garlick,  
sqy.

some time, separate schools did not work so well and have been given up, and the children have gone back again to the common school?—Yes; I have known such cases.

19115. Mr. Stokes.—Has that happened on a change of teacher in the common school?—I cannot say.

19116. Might it not result from the death or removal of, say a Protestant teacher, and the appointment in his place of a Roman Catholic teacher, or is there any provision that a Protestant teacher must succeed a Protestant teacher in these schools, and a Roman Catholic a Roman Catholic teacher?—No, there is no regulation in the common school system at all about the religion of the teacher.

19117. It might happen where the Roman Catholic majority have set up a school, that, on a change of masters at the common school, a Catholic master might be appointed?—It might.

19118. Is that case the reason for sending would disappear?—Yes.

19119. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is the religious denomination of the children taken notice of in the common school?—Not at all. There is not even a roll for the denominations.

19120. So that the system is conducted without reference to religious denominations?—It is.

19121. Lord Clonbrock.—You mentioned that fifty children were instructed by one master without any other assistant?—Yes.

19122. Do you think that one master, without any assistance of either an adult or pupil teacher, is competent to pay sufficient attention to such a number of children?—In a graded school, meaning by that a very large school with fifty children in the same class, I fancy he could teach them very well, indeed; but in a common school, under one teacher, with a gradation of three, or four, or five classes, I cannot think they would be very well taught.

19123. You said there is nothing analogous to our pupil-teacher or monitor system in Canada at all?—Nothing, as far as I know.

19124. May one reason be that boys' labour is valuable there?—Yes; that may be one reason, and possibly there is an objection to monitors on the part of the ratepayers, after paying so heavily for education, that is, paying, according to the report of '63, seven times as much for common schools as they get from the State. They may prefer to have their children taught by adult teachers.

19125. Are there any convents or monastic schools in Upper Canada paid by local funds?—I cannot say.

19126. Do the Canadian clergy give religious instruction on Saturdays, to the children, elsewhere than in the schools?—No. On Sundays I presume they do.

19127. Is the religious instruction given in Canada confined exclusively to Sunday?—No. In many cases there are week-evening services at which young people attend.

19128. Where are Sunday schools in Canada generally held?—Either in the churches or meeting-houses of the denomination, or in a building attached to it.

19129. Are there many cases, except in large towns, where there are separate buildings for Sunday schools?—No, then they are held in the school-houses.

19130. Mr. Stokes.—As there are no pupil-teachers in Canada, from what class of society are the teaching schools fed?—They are fed from the most advanced classes in the best schools.

19131. Do the boys pass from the school straight to the training school?—They do.

19132. At what age?—I should say eighteen.

19133. Do they remain in the primary school till eighteen?—Often.

19134. The *Chief Justice*.—Do you know any cases in which Irish National teachers, who have emigrated, have become schoolmasters in Canada?—Yes.

19135. Do they succeed as a rule?—They do.

19136. Do many English teachers act as schoolmasters after emigration?—Yes.

19137. Are they as popular with the parents or with the ratepayers as the Canadian grown teachers?—Well I think, hardly.

19138. And are they as popular, do you think, with the parents or ratepayers as the Canadian born teachers?—I think hardly; that is, supposing you mean by "they" the English, Irish, and Scotch teachers.

19139. Yes?—Well, I think they are hardly as popular, perhaps from the growing feeling of nationality in Canada.

19140. Do you know of any cases in which difficulty or trouble has arisen from the use of historical books in Canada, from Roman Catholics' objections?—I do not know of any cases; but I was easily convinced that there would be cases—not users making trouble, but cases of objection.

#### MR. PATRICK GALLAGHER SWORN AND EXAMINED.

Mr. Patrick  
Gallagher.

19141. The *Commissioner*.—What is the school of which you are the teacher?—Drumkerrin, in the county Leitrim.

19142. What body of teachers do you represent?—I do not know whether I may be said to represent all the teachers of Cavanagh, but I believe I may say I know all the teachers within a circle of a nine-mile radius from my own place.

19143. What is your classification?—Third division of the first class.

19144. How long have you held that position?—Since the year 1853, just fifteen years now.

19145. Have you acted as schoolmaster in many different parts of the kingdom—in many counties in Ireland?—I know some of the teachers who have been in other places.

19146. But have you, yourself, acted as teacher in many other counties?—Oh, no; I have never been a teacher in any county except my own—the county Leitrim.

19147. How long have you been teaching there?—For the last twenty-one years I have been teaching in the same village there—Drumkerrin.

19148. Were you educated in a National school yourself?—No, I was not. My father was a teacher of very humble abilities, and when he had me taught as far as he could teach me himself, he sent me to a

better teacher than he was when I was a boy, so that I may say I got none of my education in a National school.

19149. You underwent a training, of course, before you were appointed to a school under the Board?—No, but soon after.

19150. When was that?—In the spring of 1849.

19151. At Marlboro' street?—Yes.

19152. What was the point which the masters you represent here specially desired you should call our attention to?—Principally three things, which they consider grievances.

19153. Will you kindly name them?—The three things—one is the insufficiency of the present scale of salaries; the second is the want of pensions for old teachers; and the third point is the amount of rent which they have to pay, some for their school-houses only, and some for their school-houses and residences.

19154. Have you any residence attached to your school?—Yes, my school-house and residence are in one house in fact—the house is a two storied one, one floor is occupied by the school, and the other I occupy for my residence. The house is thirty feet long, by eighteen feet broad, and for that I pay a rent, out of my own salary, of £8 per year. I have that house only for the past four years; before that I had



Nov. 27, 1886.  
Mr. Patrick  
Gallagher.

two houses—one for my residence, and the other for my school, for each I paid £3 a year rent, then I had repairs to make from time to time, which, I calculated, cost another £1, so I may put it down that I have paid for the last twenty-one years a yearly sum of £8 for rent.

19155. Is the landlord to whom you pay rent the manager or patron of the school you teach?—No, he is neither, he is a very humble man—a man in a humble rank in life, who just built this house on a piece of ground he had near the village, thinking he would get a good rent for it as a shop. He was disappointed in getting it that way, and then he let it to me.

19156. Is your school under lay or clerical management?—Clerical.

19157. Roman Catholic?—Roman Catholic clergy.

19158. Lord Clonbrock?—You say you paid the rent yourself for that school?—Yes.

19159. Did you set up the school for yourself, and obtain a manager afterwards, or did the manager start it first, and then employ you?—Well, that brings me back to the time when the school was taken into consideration with the Board.

19160. When was that?—In October, 1847. In the month of May, 1847, I became tenant for the two houses I mentioned a moment ago, and then I spoke to the managers.

19161. You first of all, then, took the house and became the tenant?—Yes.

19162. And then applied to the priest to become the manager, and put it under the Board?—That is so.

19163. Did you then at first start the school to an advantage at your own risk?—No; I was a teacher, and taught a school—not a National one—before that I found I could not support myself by it, then I put myself under the manager in order to get under the Board, that I might be able to earn sufficient to support myself and my family by my occupation.

19164. You rented the school, and opened it, contemplating putting it under the control of the Board?—Yes.

19165. As your own voluntary act?—Oh, yes.

19166. Mr. Gibbons.—Who forwarded the application for the school being connected with the Board at that time?—The managers.

19167. The Chairman.—What is the ordinary amount of rent paid by schoolmasters for their schools?—Well, I should say that mine is the highest, for where the school is away from the village the rent is lower. I would say the ordinary amount would be about £2 a year.

19168. Have you any land in connection with your house?—No.

19169. Not even a garden?—No.

19170. Is there any reluctance in landlords in your part of Ireland to accept schoolmasters as tenants?—I don't know that there is, but if allowed I will state what occurred to myself within the last month.

19171. If you please?—Feeling that it was a heavy drawback on my resources to have to pay this rent of £8, and knowing that there was a part of the village market-house vacant, in which a school of the Church Education Society was formerly held, I thought it would suit me. The society had used it as a school for some time, then the teacher went away, and the place was unoccupied. The agent was there a few days ago, and application was made to him on my behalf for the school, but he refused to let it unless on the terms of getting a rent for it, and he asked £6 a year. That of course was beyond my means, and so it was refused to me, although I know that the landlord gave that same place to the Church Education Society gratis, and not only that, but also endowed the school, so to speak, by giving £10 a year by way of salary to the teacher. Still it was refused to me for my school, except at the rent of £6 a year.

19172. Is there any system of retiring pensions for aged schoolmasters in any other part of the United Kingdom—in England or Scotland?—I am not aware, indeed, whether there is such a thing or not.

19173. In Ireland are not the schoolmasters the servants of the managers, and not of the State?—Well, that is rather a difficult question for me to answer. Of course we know, as far as education is concerned, we are the servants of the managers and must be directed by them, and take our directions from them, but we know that we get our money from the State, and it is from the State we would expect to get pensions when we get advanced in life and wish to perform our duties.

19174. Does the State propose to pay the whole of the salaries or only a certain proportion of them?—At first it was intended that the State should pay only a certain proportion, and that the school-fee should be given in addition—I think so—but of my own knowledge I cannot give a precise answer to that question. But I know what school-fee amount to in my own school, having made a calculation the last few days.

19175. What are they?—The average for the last five years is about eight guineas a year—for each of the past two years it was only £7.

19176. Is it your experience that in Connaught the school managers discourage schoolmasters from obtaining school-fee, even from parents who are able to pay them?—No; as far as I know it is just the other way. The manager, who is our priest, encourages the teacher as much as possible, and always recommends the parents of the children who are able to pay to do so, and encourages the teacher further by showing him that he is entitled to those fees and should look for them.

19177. Do you think that the children whose parents pay attend more regularly than the others?—I cannot say. The comfortable children are the children generally of farmers; at two periods of the year the attendance of these children is very irregular. These periods are harvest and spring, when they are kept away to lend a hand in farming operations, and it is only children under about five or six years of age, who are so as in that way, who can well come to school at those times.

19178. In "spring" operations do you mean to include anything else besides the sowing of potatoes?—Sowing oats.

19179. According to your experience do the children stay away from school eagerly or for good reasons?—I think it is, generally speaking, because they are employed by their parents in some way like what I have mentioned.

19180. Then it would be, you think, for a good reason?—Well, generally I would say so, but those, no doubt, may give rise to their staying away at other times for very little reasons, if any at all.

19181. Do you think that parents generally throughout the country are inclined to keep their children away from school for a small cause or that they are desirous that they should be at school as much as they are possible apart from that?—My own conviction is that the greater number keep them at school as much as they can possibly spare them.

19182. Do you think that the opinion of the value of getting schooling for their children is increasing among the Irish peasantry?—I am not prepared to answer that, because I think the Irish peasantry do not yet sufficiently appreciate the value of education for their children.

19183. Do they in small towns appreciate it more than in the country districts?—In the village in which I live the attendance at the school is just as irregular as it is in any of the schools a few miles from the village.

19184. What is the number on your roll now?—About 140 or 142.

19185. About what was the attendance the last day you had school opened?—I can only guess that. I think about 68.

19186. At this particular period of the year how would you account for the absence of the remaining children?—Some of them are very easily accounted for, for the potato digging had not ceased at the time

Nov. 27, 1892.  
Mr. Patrick  
Galagher.

I name up, and I believe some of the children were so employed.

19187. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What was the number in attendance on the 25th of June, when the constable counted them?—I don't recollect. I knew the average attendance for several years back. I can give that if necessary.

19188. The Chairman.—If you please?—The average attendance in 1859 was 67, in 1861, 74, in 1863, 67, in 1865, 67, in 1866, 71; in 1865, 61; 1866, 61; and in 1867, 64.

19189. Have you much admixture of religious denominations in your school?—I will state to you how that is. At present there are about twenty Protestant children on the roll. For some years after my school was put in connection with the Board—viz., from 1847, to the year 1856, about 30 per cent. of the children on my roll were Protestants. Then the Church Education Society's school was got up in the same village, and the Protestant children left my school and went there, and while that school was in operation in the village I had only Roman Catholic children. Then when the Church Education Society's school was discontinued the Protestant children came to me again, and to the best of my opinion, I think there are about twenty names of Protestants on the roll now.

19190. Have any differences or questions arisen in this school about the use of religious instruction or the rates relating to it?—Never. Before 1856 the Protestant clergymen used to come and appoint a day for religious instruction. I believe it was not convenient in my place, there was no room in the school-house for separate religious instruction to be given in it, and therefore the clergymen used to take the children up to the church, which was not a long walk, they came back to me again, after the clergymen had finished with them. But within the present year—the master comes to the school and asks if there are any of his children there, they hold up their little hands, and then he brings them to the upper room in the market-house that I spoke of a while ago, and after they are done there, the children come back to me again.

19191. With regard to the question of pay, you said the masters you represent don't enter into the question of whether that increase of pay should come from the State, or anywhere else, only that there should be an augmentation of pay?—Exactly so. It is, of course, immaterial practically to us from what source it comes; but we desire the increase for the support of ourselves and our families. I think I can prove that necessity from my own experience. My eldest daughter was senior paid mistress, when she had passed through the regular course she was made assistant in my school. While her salary for those places was coming in, I was able with my own resources and salary to support my family pretty well. In the year 1867, last year, she left me, and got married, I have no such assistance since then, and consequently I have not been able to meet my demands as I ought or would like, in fact, I think, as well as I can calculate it, that at present I am in debt about £20 in consequence. If there was one of my children appointed assistant in the school, it would of course relieve me from a great deal of embarrassment. But the salaries are too low. I know there are other teachers who feel the same thing, and that their salaries would not enable them to give themselves respectable clothing and maintain themselves. Some of the teachers may not feel it so much, because they reside with their parents and receive their support with them, and therefore they don't feel the burden as others like myself, who have to maintain ourselves and our families.

19192. Would you and the masters you represent object to your salaries being paid by what is called in England, "results," that is, according to the number of children who would be able to pass an examination each year in certain subjects?—I heard of that way, but I cannot say I understand it fully, those to whom I have spoken on the subject are quite against it, because it would be injurious to education itself.

19193. How is that?—It would lead to a system of

examining which would be injurious to the interest of education. They think that the teachers would be inclined to have certain of the pupils prepared up like for show, while others might, in consequence, be neglected. In a school of say sixty children, the greater part of whom would be in the younger classes, the teacher might be led to neglect the larger number in order that he might the better prepare the head class, and thus make more by the school.

19194. Do you think if the schoolmaster was paid so much a head for each child when he passed in a particular subject, and if the children were passed on from one class to another as they became qualified, that that would not be an inducement to the master to attend to the general body of his pupils?—I don't know how that might be. Indeed I can't say I fully understand the meaning of what is called "payment by results."

19195. What remedy can you suggest for the hardship inflicted on schoolmasters in having to pay rent for their schools, and in paying for the repairs of the school?—I don't know. I think it would be preposterous in a man like me to make any remarks on that matter. What I meant to do was, just to state that before the Commissioners, as a grievance which we felt, with the humble request that you would be prepared to recommend some remedy for that grievance.

19196. But you are not yourself prepared to make any suggestion about it?—I am not.

19197. The Chairman.—Do you think it is any advantage for a schoolmaster to have a garden attached to his house?—It would be some advantage I think, but there are a great many schools where they are at a greater loss than the want of a garden.

19198. How is that?—In what respect?—Well, when the children want to go any place, they have no place to go to.

19199. That is, the school wants offices attached?—Exactly, that is what I wished to convey. They are at a great loss some of them for offices for the accommodation of the children, and that is a very great loss.

19200. You think that having proper offices for the accommodation of the children attending the school, should be more insisted upon by the Board than it is now?—Well, I don't know to what extent the Board do insist upon it at present, but in the interests of morality itself I think such a thing ought to be insisted on as much as possible.

19201. Do you think the Board should refuse to take into consideration with it any school which had not proper offices attached?—I don't say that, for the effect might then be, that the Board would refuse to connect the only school in a locality where the children would in consequence be deprived of the benefits of schooling altogether. For instance, if my own school was refused to be connected on that account, it would leave the village without a National school at all, and would deprive me of my poor means of support.

19202. When I spoke of the necessity of a garden attached to the school-house, I meant that it should be for the purpose of enabling the master to get vegetables for his own family use?—Oh yes, that would be a great benefit. I know some teachers who have small farms attached to their places. Indeed, I know one who is after spending between £60 and £80 on the building of a school-house, and he got a grant from Mr. Foster of £50, I think, and the school-house is now a very fine one—it is on his own farm—about five acres of land he has, and he pays a rent for it.

19203. Do you think that a schoolmaster could attend to more than five acres of land, and pay proper attention at the same time to his school?—Well, that would depend very much upon whether he had any one—his wife or child—who would be able to see after the land, and give directions about it while he was occupied in his school.

19204. Are there five acres you spoke of pasture or arable?—They keep some for growing their cattle, and some part of it for growing oats.

19205 How do they manage the ploughing of that land?—Oh, there is no ploughing done there.

19206 How then?—All by spade labour.

19207 Are those lands held by lease?—No, I think not; the one that I have been speaking of is held by the man as tenant at will.

19208 That is the man who has built the school-house on the farm?—Yes, I can name the school if you like.

19209 Do if you please?—It is Lincroft.

19210 The three points on which you and your friends feel aggrieved then are pay, pension, and rent?—Yes.

19211 Earl of Downham—Have you got any scale of payment drawn up which you would consider would be sufficient to get rid of the first grievance?—No. But in talking over these matters with my brother teachers, we have spoken together about it, and I may say it is what we all would agree upon, that the lowest salary that the principal teacher ought to receive should be £1 a week.

19212 A third class teacher?—Yes.

19213 The Chairman—Do you think that a master of such a school would be worth to the State £52 a year?—I should say he would be a very bad schoolmaster indeed if he was not worth £1 a week.

19214 But do you think he is a good and efficient schoolmaster for the State if he remained all his time in the second or third class?—Certainly not. He should get up from that; and that reminds me of another matter, which is, that the promotion from class to class, amongst the teachers, is too slow, on account of the number of grades through which he has to go. We would respectfully submit that all these grades should be abolished and even some of the grades in the first class also.

19215 How would you propose them then?—I think there should be only two grades in the first class, and none in the others.

19216 Then you would have four grades altogether, two in the first class, one in the second, and one in the third?—That is it.

19217 What would you propose as the amount of salary for the second class?—We would consider that it would be rather presumptuous for men of our rank to speak of that, but we would suggest, as the lowest payment, £52 a year for third class.

19218 Do you mean by that, £52 paid by the State, or from all sources?—I would say from the State, because the only other source from which we receive any payment is the school fees, and these only range from about £2 to £5 a year. In my school the average is somewhat higher—£8 a year about; but these fees are paid in such very small sums that it would be much more satisfactory for me to have even a smaller sum paid by the State instead. I would myself be glad to take £4 a year from the State, instead of the £7 or £8 I get from the fees.

19219 To take £4 a year instead £8?—Yes. For the £4 a year, if paid by the State, would be paid together and satisfactorily.

19220 Do you receive any land and from the landholder?—Not a penny, nor do I know of any teacher who does, except one. There is one gentleman who has schools on his property, whether indeed it is his own property or that of the gentleman he is agent for, I cannot rightly tell, and I believe that some of the teachers on that property receive from that gentleman £5, and some, I think, £10. I could name the gentleman if necessary, Mr. Francis La Touche, of Lettist. Then in the county Roscommon, which is very near to my place, their houses are provided for them, such as the schools on the property of Colonel Youssau, where the teachers tell me that their houses are made very comfortable for them, and they are well encouraged by her ladyship—Lady Louisa Youssau.

19221 How do you account for this difference between the two counties?—I cannot account for it. I can only state the fact that education is patronised by her ladyship, and is not in the county Lettist.

19222 Have you any definite suggestion to make with respect to retiring pensions?—Nothing more than this, that I think if a teacher was incapable from age or health, of continuing to teach after having given twenty-one years' service to the State, or if he was able to serve for more than that time, say for twenty-five or thirty years, let him remain at his duty, but that on serving twenty-one years he should be entitled to a pension, the amount of which would, of course, be increased if he served a longer time than that in proportion.

19223 Mr. Gless—Is it a general thing among all the teachers to pay the rent of the schools? You say that the teachers within a radius of nine miles from you, want you here, is it general for them to pay rent?—I would not exactly say that they sent me, but I know the tendency within a circle of that extent.

19224 Is it quite common in that district for the teachers to have to pay the rent of their schools?—In general. In the parish of Inishinagh from which I came, it is quite common, but not in the county Roscommon. I can name the schools for which rent is paid.

19225 Do if you please?—These are the schools of Drunkernan, ray own, Shannon View, Shredlagh, Tollyclerna, Ardunney, and Tinton; all the teachers of these schools pay rent for their school houses, at least £2 each, my own, Drunkernan, is £8, as I have already mentioned, comprising both residence and school. I know some of the others pay, a little more than £2 a year. There is one school I know, it is a female school, for which the teacher pays no rent, because the house was built by the brother of the teacher upon his own land. He built it himself, and then got the school taken into connection with the Board. I suppose the building of the house cost him at least twenty pounds.

19226 Mr. Dwyer—Would you not consider it a great advantage if a dwelling-house and small piece of land were provided for the teachers as a part of the emoluments of their office?—I am sure I don't know. That would be equivalent to changing the teacher rent, if his salary was reduced by that.

19227 That is not what I mean to convey, I mean, if the State was to provide for each teacher, or if some party, other than the teacher himself, was to provide for him a dwelling-house and a small portion of land?—That would be a great boon.

19228 Are these schools which you mentioned within one parish?—They are all, except one.

19229 Is there any large proprietor in that parish?—Yes; I know one, Mr. Montgomery, who was once a Member of Parliament.

19230 Is he a resident proprietor?—Yes.

19231 Are any of these schools on his property?—They are.

19232 Are there other large proprietors?—There are; but they are not resident in the parish.

19233 Is he the principal proprietor there?—I might say he is. There are others there, but I don't know which has the greatest amount of property in it.

19234 Rev. Dr. Wilson—I was under the impression you represented the Cavanagh teachers here—is that the case?—Well, I cannot say that it is. There are two or three associations who named me as a fit person to come up before this Commission, but I have answered the questions put to me from what is within my own knowledge.

19235 Did these associations of teachers come to any general resolution upon the different topics which you were to bring before me to-day?—I believe at Monaghan, they deliberated, and the result of their deliberations coincided with my own opinion, and was exactly as I have stated that opinion here.

19236 Did these associations put forward any other grievances or statement in addition to those on which you have dwelt?—Yes.

19237 What?—Upon one point, and that is, with respect to pensions, to show that the compensation given by the Board of Education is not sufficient for

No. 27, 1892.  
Mr. Patrick Gallagher.

Nov. 27, 1898.

Mr. Patrick  
Gallagher.

the purpose for which it is intended. As illustrating this, if I might be allowed, I would read a letter which I had from a teacher in Manchester since I came up to town.

19238. Rev. Dr. Fisher.—Read it, please.—I will; it is as follows:—

Lungby, Manchester, 10th day of Nov. 1898.

Dear Mr. Gallagher,—I had Mr. McGowan here to day. Do you know him? He taught in Ekeville, Keshoge, was forced to resign, after eighteen years' service, on a charge of sedition, which he has paid, and is now in education. I told him I would consult you of his case. He said you knew it very well. Hoping you will sleep in Dublin, I never do with the same. Yours very sincerely,

THOMAS CURRANE

Mr. Gallagher,  
25, Desmont-street, Dublin.

19239. What was his resignation owing to?—I don't know, but I saw him about two years last August, I think, and he told me he got compensation—£44; he said he was then going to look if he could get some other situation. He was travelling, say southwards, and went as far as Athlone, for I met him afterwards, and he told me he had been there, and had been unsuccessful.

19240. Are there many such cases within the district which you here represent?—That is the only one I know.

19241. How long had he been there?—Eighteen years.

19242. Have the teachers appointed to come up to Dublin held a meeting here since they came up?—I have seen other teachers, and conversed with them.

19243. Have you seen them in connexion with the evidence to be given before this Commission?—I have spoken to them, but not with any view either of modifying my own opinions, or of stating opinions to be laid before you. What I have stated here I have told from my own knowledge altogether.

19244. I see by the public papers a statement to the effect that representative teachers went to meet together in Dublin, in order to arrange the points which they were to bring before this Commission—were you at any of those meetings?—I was not.

19245. All your grievances are money grievances, and no more?—These are the principal ones.

19246. Is it true that some teachers complain of the manner through which their payments come?—No; I have heard no complaint about it. Some few years since there used to be longer delay in the payment, but within the present year the payments come more or less as they should.

19247. Then, do we understand that the teachers from Comaught have no reason to complain of delay in their payment by the managers of the schools, either from neglect or from absence from home?—No cause of complaint in their payment.

19248. Have the teachers you represent anything to say as to the powers of the managers as to the dismissal of the teachers?—I think not. I think it is only that the teachers feel that the power rests with the managers, but I have never heard any instance of one teacher being dismissed in an unjust way.

19249. Allow me to read you part of the programme adopted at a meeting of teachers at Omeagh lately, part of the programme to be brought before this Commission:—"That the District Inspector being a sufficient check upon the veracity of returns, the Secretaries of the National Board be directed to address all documents relating to the payment of salaries directly to the teachers, and thus remove the source of numerous heart-burnings and delays, and that the rule which gives to any individual the power of peremptorily dismissing teachers from their schools be immediately reversed." Do you or the teachers you represent feel these to be grievances?—We have no practical knowledge of them. I know it would be my opinion that if the money was sent from the office direct to the teachers, it would be ignominious to the teacher, for it would be ignoring the manager altogether, and that, I think, would be wrong.

19250. With regard to pay, the payment of school-

fees seems to amount to a very small sum?—That is so.

19251. You have said that your school was a mixed school?—It is.

19252. Are there any other denominations in it but the members of the Established and of the Roman Catholic Church?—Only the two.

19253. From how many children do you receive a definite payment, more or less, per quarter?—I know there is a large number of them who pay nothing.

19254. You have said that the landlords don't assist you by making you any special grant?—No, they do not.

19255. Do the managers of the schools?—Not one shilling.

19256. Does your answer apply to all managers, whether clerical or lay?—No; it applies only to elected managers, of whom I have a knowledge. I know the priests don't pay, but I don't know whether the schools on Mr. Tenison's property receive any payment from the managers or not. I know on Mr. La Touche's property they do.

19257. You say that the managers of the schools in Comaught encourage the payment by the children of the school-fees?—Yes.

19258. What is the nature and extent of that encouragement?—Well, there is a notion abroad among many of the people who are able to pay the fee, but who are unwilling to do so, that their children ought to be educated in a National school free; and it is only when they are forced to do it by being summoned for the amount to the Petty Sessions Court that they pay. Then they complain to the managers, and the managers say to them, "You must pay your school-fees."

19259. Are there many cases in which it is requisite to proceed against them in that way to recover fees?—Not many.

19260. Then, it is only when such cases do arise that the manager interferes?—Yes.

19261. There are not many you say?—No, indeed.

19262. Not more, perhaps, than one in five hundred?—No, not as much as that, I think; the cases are few.

19263. Over and above what you have mentioned, what is the nature and extent of the encouragement given by the managers of the schools to secure payment of the fees?—Nothing more than that.

19264. The success does not seem to have been very great, taking your own school as an example?—No, indeed.

19265. Is there any other National school near you?—There are, I think, ten in the parish altogether.

19266. Ten? How far is the nearest one from your school?—About two miles off.

19267. In case you were compelled to enforce payment of the school-fees from the parents of children attending your school, would you have any reason to fear that the parents would remove the children from your school, and send them to another near you, for the purpose of avoiding payment of the school-fees?—I have heard of such cases.

19268. That they leave one school and go to another to avoid proceedings for recovery of the fees?—I have heard of that being sometimes done. It is one of the last things, however, which any teacher who wishes to have himself accounted respectable would resort to, to summon the parents of his pupils to the court for such small sums. They seldom amount to more than five shillings or so, and any teacher desirous to be respectable and having any regard for himself in the locality, would not like to be seen going into court against the people for such small amounts.

19269. Mr. Stokes—How long have you been teaching in connexion with the Board?—For twenty-one years—since the year 1847.

19270. And during that long period has your school never received any contribution from other sources but the Board and those small fees from pupils?—Never.

19271. From the managers or landlords?—No.

19272. Is there any collection ever made for the school in the chapel of the village?—No, there are a great many of the people in the place poor.

Nov. 27, 1898.  
Mr. Patrick  
Callaghan.

19273. Are there any vested schools in your neighborhood? Are any of the schools of recent foundation, or are they all old ones?—They are not old ones; they are all started inside the time of my own, except one. That one, Tramon, is established longer than mine.

19274. Is the number of National schools in your neighborhood increasing?—In my own neighborhood, Drunkkreen, the number is not increasing.

19275. In the case of vacancies are teachers always ready to accept them, even on the conditions which seem to them rather hard?—Qualified teachers are not ready to accept them, but there are teachers who have never taught schools before, but who, of course, have passed the examination who get them. There is not much inclination on the part of the qualified men to take a new school.

19276. Do you consider the moral and religious results produced in your school as an important part of the effect of the education you give?—I do; I would consider myself a very unfaithful teacher if I didn't try to have a good moral tone pervading the school in all its operations. Of course teaching a mixed school I cannot give as much of the religious instruction as I might desire, but I think a teacher would ill discharge his duty who did not seek to have a tone of morality pervading the children of his school, so far as his duties were concerned.

19277. Could you produce these results without the support and assistance of the managers?—I think not.

19278. You said you didn't understand the system of what is called "payment by results"?—I did. I cannot say that I fully understand the subject.

19279. Have you looked closely into the individual attendance of the children at your school?—I have.

19280. Do you see great irregularity in that attendance?—I do.

19281. Do you think that measures ought to be adopted to promote as far as practicable a more regular attendance?—I think that would be a thing which every teacher ought to feel proud of being proposed, and I think any such measure would be entitled to the greatest support from them.

19282. Suppose the salary of a master be maintained as at present, and some such scheme as this be adopted—that for each child who attends at the school for at least one hundred days in the year, and comes before the Inspector and passes an examination according to his class—in, say, reading, writing, and arithmetic—the school should receive one shilling for each subject; and that if having passed in those subjects the master is enabled to send the child forward for a further examination on two other subjects such as geography or grammar, as might be arranged, it should receive for every child who passed such further examination another two shillings?—That is one shilling for each child.

19283. Yes, for each child who attended the fixed number of days in the year and who passed the individual examination—do you think that such a system would improve the master's position, and at the same time raise the attendance of the children at the school?—It appears to me too intricate a subject for me to offer an opinion upon. I can't say that I fully understand it myself, but if I would express an opinion upon it it would be that it is too intricate a question for me to attempt to give a decisive answer to. It is for gentlemen of rank and position to decide what would be for the benefit of the country.

19284. Don't you think that the man who is able to produce a better school is more entitled to a high salary than the master who cannot show the same results?—That might be the case, of course, if all other things were equal; but I can easily see how the good master might not be able to show the same results, although he might have more work than another.

19285. How is that?—I take, for instance, my own school. In such a school a master would rarely make any progress, and be able to show more work among his children, if the attendance was more regular, than he could with the attendance so irregular as it is.

19286. Do you consider it just and fair that the man who does less work should have as much salary from the State as the man who does more?—He may do as much work, though from the circumstances of his school, either its position or the attendance at it, he may not be able to show as much results from it. I have to ask the pardon of the gentlemen here, if I have seemed to say anything disrespectful to them in any of my answers; but I intended to be as respectful to them as I could, while I have humbly ventured to express my opinions before them.

19287. The Chairman.—We have no reason to think otherwise, and we are much obliged for the candid way in which you are stating your views to us.

19288. Mr. Stokes.—Has an account of the system of payment by results ever got into your parish or attracted your notice?—It is only of late it began to be spoken about.

19289. If the means of bettering his position are placed within the reach of the hard-working master, do you think that would remove all fair ground of complaint?—I think so. I would gladly do the work.

19290. You don't think that the idle master should fairly come before the National Board and say give me £52 a year?—No, for I say the idle master should be paid nothing.

19291. You would not object to an individual examination of the children of your school?—Oh, no, I would not.

19292. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I presume that the objection to payment by results in your district is due to the scattered population of the country?—Yes.

19293. And the consequent difficulty from irregular attendance of getting up the children to the required standard, to enable the school to payment from the results?—Yes, I think so.

19294. But would not a moderate system of payment by results act as a stimulus, both upon teachers and children, and help to secure an attendance?—I don't know that it would. The rural population are so wedded to old habits that I think they would, in any case, have their children at home on those two occasions—the spring and autumn examinations.

19295. Mr. Stokes.—What would be the consequence of granting pensions to the masters of the schools: would not the masters then withdraw from the school when they had served their minimum time?—I think that would very much depend upon the amount of the pension.

19296. Don't you think it might lead to good men with experience leaving the schools just when they might be most needed, and when they could continue on their duties, although advanced in years, perhaps by getting some assistance?—Well, I don't know that. My own father was seventy-six years of age when he died, and I think after he got to be sixty years old he was not able so much for the fatiguing work of a school.

19297. How old are you, yourself?—I may say I am fifty. I will be fifty in March next.

19298. If it was open to you would you retire now?—Well, I would not like to retire as long as I had health and strength to do the work of my school, for I am fond of my work—to me a well-known phrase "I love my vocation," if I may venture to take the liberty of saying so here, and, therefore, I would not seek to retire while I could discharge my duties—and I would seek to get the question of pensions established in order that when I became unfit for my work I might have something to support me for the remainder of my days. Of course, my incapacity for duty could be easily ascertained by my physical state, or by an examination of the condition of my school by the Inspector, for he could easily tell whether I had sufficient energy still to give the amount and character of instruction required.

19299. Have you considered the conditions upon which pensions might be granted?—No, I have not.

19300. I think you said a man should be entitled to a pension when he has served twenty-one years?—I did, that period occurred to me, because in some

Nov. 27, 1893.  
Mr. Patrick  
Gallagher.

parts of the public service that is the time after serving which a man gains a pension. In the army I think that is the way, and in the Constabulary too.

19301. Do you mean that that service of twenty-one years should be continuous—should not be broken by any interval?—I would mean that, but it would not be for me to fix the particulars in such a point as that, you are the best judges of that matter.

19302. Do you think that that twenty-one years' service should be in one school?—Oh, no, certainly not. I think the twenty-one years might be served in different schools.

19303. Do you think that a master who changes his school every six months is as valuable as the master who remains in the one school for twenty-one years?—Well, I feel some difficulty in answering that, because I, myself, am an instance of a master who has been twenty-one years in one school, and the question, then, is, in answer to asking me if I consider myself as valuable, or more valuable, than other masters who have made changes during that time.

19304. The Chairman.—Are there many masters who change their schools so frequently as every six months?—I don't know any who do so.

19305. Mr. Glavin.—Do you not think that if the people of your neighbourhood knew that you would receive a larger income from the State, if the attendance of the children at your school was regular for at least a certain number of days in each year, they would be induced, on your account, or through your influence to send their children to school more regularly?—I don't think, with all respect, that that is the way a school should be maintained; that would be the result of a more selfish consideration on the part of the teacher, and I don't think the teacher would like to be placed in such a position. I believe the children should be sent to the school through the influence of the managers. In fact, in the way suggested, the teachers would be simply begging the attendance of pupils, and that is a thing which, if I could at all avoid, I would scarcely submit to.

19306. But do you not think that out of regard for benefiting you, the parents would send the children more regularly?—I don't think any such result would follow.

19307. Mr. Stokes.—Have you any other situation besides teaching the school?—I have.

19308. What is it?—I am Deputy Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages. Of course I have only to register those when the Registrar is absent; and he allows me £1 a quarter for doing that. It occupies very little time, and can be done generally after, but sometimes before school hours, so it does not interfere with my school duties.

19309. What do you gain in the year by selling the Board's books?—That is easily calculated, I have made ten shillings this year.

19310. Have you ever thought whether you might not add something to your income by selling other books or publications besides those of the Board?—No, I have not, it would not pay.

19311. How is that?—The village is so small it would not pay; the people don't buy many books; I don't think £1 a year could be made by it.

19312. Is there no demand for literature of any kind?—Very little, the village is small, and the people don't belong to the class who buy much in that way.

19313. Mr. Glavin.—Is there not a fair held in the town?—Yes, there are twelve in the year.

19314. And a market?—Yes, but it is very small.

19315. And do hawkers attend the fairs with books and other things?—They do, but they don't make much.

19316. The Chairman.—Do you receive any allowance for long service?—I have an allowance.

19317. How much is it?—At present it is £3 10s.

19318. Mr. Stokes.—For how long have you enjoyed that well-deserved addition?—I think it is my second year to have received it.

19319. Are there any assistants employed in your school?—Yes, my son is junior monitor since the beginning of the present year; and I am expecting to get my second daughter appointed as an assistant, because I can scarcely get on without that.

19320. Do these children of yours intend to become teachers?—Well I could scarcely say that, one of my sons who did assist me is gone away to a draper's shop in Sligo.

19321. And what is the present one inclined to do—to remain and be a teacher?—I think the younger one is more inclined to follow after his brother.

19322. Are there females attending the school?—There are.

19323. Have you a workmistress in it now?—Not now, my wife used to act as workmistress, that was at the time when my eldest daughter was an assistant; and the Board would not pay both. My eldest daughter then received the appointment of assistant, but has since left; and I believe there is an application made by the manager for me now, for the purpose of having my second daughter appointed assistant.

19324. Who is your Inspector?—Mr. Robinson.

19325. And your Head Inspector?—I believe it is Mr. O'Callaghan.

[Adjourned.]

# FIFTIETH DAY.—DUBLIN, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1893.

## PRESENT:

The Right Hon. the Earl of PONT, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. the Earl of DUNRIVEN, &c.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLOSTERBROCK  
Sir ROBERT KANE, *P.R.S.*  
WILLIAM BRIDGE, Esq., &c.

REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
REV. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, &c.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASHMYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., *M.D.*  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., *O.C.* } *Secretaries.*  
D. E. DUNN, Esq.

JAMES WILLIAM KAVANAGH, Esq., further examined.

Nov. 28, 1893.

JAMES Wm.  
Kavanagh,  
Esq.

19326. Mr. Sullivan.—Have you any document to hand in?—Yes. I have fortunately received a copy of the missing letter referred to in my examination, July 11th, written by me, as Head Inspector, to the Commissioners of National Education, dated Greystown, Delgany, 29th of August, 1886: subject—the projected erection of the Model School in Rindinacree,

just then decided on, by Board's Order. My letter, remonstrating against this Order, is as follows:—

"Greystown, Delgany,  
"29th August, 1886.

"GENTLEMEN,—In reference to your letter, intimating that the Commissioners have decided upon the erection of a District Model School in Rindinacree, I feel it my duty to inform you

that the success of such an establishment, in Kinsersley, is extremely doubtful, and depends upon so many and such imponderable circumstances that, were they all stated to the Board, I apprehend they would hesitate to risk the expenditure of some six or eight thousand pounds upon the undertaking. Kinsersley has a population of only 6,000 inhabitants, and has several good schools, already. The Convent Female National School is attended by about 500 girls. The Lanesianus Male National School is a considerable number, and there are other excellent schools, in which the Roman Catholic clergy and people feel the deepest interest. Kinsersley is the depository in residence of the Hon. Charles Sadler, and the late Mr. Murphy, who died in the present month, was quite unfavorable to a school, or to any other than ordinary National schools, for Roman Catholics, under his spiritual charge. I learned his opinions at St. Peter's College, Wexford, some five years past, when I called as his kinsship, and that time the controversy respecting the Waterford Model School was active. Considering the possibility, it is not so more unreasonable a supposition, that his successor, in the bishopric, will hold similar opinions—the small population of the town, his personal acquaintance and influence of Roman Catholics, and the existing educational institutions, which their own zeal and possessions have established, Kinsersley is not an encouraging site for a District Model School. The Commissioners are already aware that, as the Roman Catholic clergy and the vast weight of the influential parties in Wexford bearing that name were on foot to start further expense on the subject of the establishment of a school at such a place, though, notwithstanding, the expense was furnished by them that they were quite opposed to the project. The proceedings at Wexford cannot fail to ensure a very great influence in reference to the question in Kinsersley, distant only eleven or twelve miles from it."

At this point comes in the part of the letter which was read on a former occasion by the Rev. Dr. Wilson. All the previous part, which I have just read, he wholly omitted. Dr. Wilson writes "Glasgow, Delany," he omits all reference to the subject-matter of the letter—the name "Kinsersley," or any reference to it, never occurs, directly or indirectly, to show what the document really is. Thereby totally altering the meaning of the passage quoted, which could be understood only from the context. I now read from the official report of the evidence of the 13th July (Q. 12665), the middle part of that letter quoted by Dr. Wilson, and which follows what I have just read.

12627. The Chairman.—Are you reading from the draft of your letter or from a copy?—I am reading from a copy, published in the *Pressman's Journal*, 28th September, 1851, a copy having been then obtained by me from the Board, after I had left the service. Two subscriptions were addressed by me, at that date, to the Lord Lieutenant. (The witness reads extract of letter given in the evidence, No 12665, as follows) —

"August 30th, 1850.

"Looking over the map and bearing in mind the locality of existing model schools and also the feelings of influential local parties on the subject, I am of opinion that inquiries should be made in Mayo (p. 11, 1846), as to whether the establishment of a model school is desired by the bulk of the people. Next, in order, in Ards (p. 5, 218), next, in Kesh (p. 8, 395), next, in Tully (p. 4, 301), next, in Mullow (p. 5, 455), then, Enniscorthy (p. 4, 445), then Kinsersley (p. 6, 886). If a line be drawn from Lanesborough in Cork, three model schools only lie to the west of it, all the others being eastward, and if a north-east and south-west line be drawn from Fair Head in Antrim to Mount Island in Cork, and this line would very nearly bisect the island, two will lie to the west of it (Lanesborough and Galway), and all the others to the east of it. (Lester has the Central Model, West Dublin, Rathmore, Athy, and Trillick schools, and Waterford, Ballinacorney, and Channel on his list, and whereas Comberghat has but one such establishment."

I now, my lord, resume the reading of the omitted part of the letter—

"I have then stated my opinion from a mass of public data; but I offer no advice on the subject, contented with placing the matter before the Commissioners, whose first answer to me respecting the Kinsersley Model School, was that they intended to commence its erection shortly."

"I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant."

"JAMES W. KAVANAGH, Road Inspector."

"The Secretaries,  
"Education Office, Dublin."

12628. Mr. Sullivan.—Have you any observation to make on that?—No, under the circumstances, I will make none. With regard to previous parts of my evidence, I beg to remind your lordship and the Commission that a suppressed portion of a report of mine—a general report on the General Model School in 1851—was produced here in evidence; the very document

itself in my own handwriting, was handed to me, and which I identified. I stated to your lordship that I had no objection whatever, that this suppressed portion of my Report should be put in evidence, yet it was withdrawn. This affords further matter of public complaint in the administration of the National Board. This excluded passage was obtained, not through any order of the Commission, as such, but by a private individual, a member of the Commission. The very original document itself was taken out of, or obtained from, a public office, and not a copy; and I understood that this passage may be placed in some part of your proceedings, notwithstanding the having been withdrawn, and not withdrawn at any instance, for here I beg to say I have never written anything in my life, as a public officer, that I am afraid or ashamed to have produced against me. I have also to refer to three other public documents that were produced: one, a letter of mine, addressed to Archbishop Whately, in 1851 (Q. 12462), another, a letter I wrote from London to the National Board, in 1850, after I had left the service (Q. 12455); and, another, a report of mine left in the report book, as an ordinary visitor of the General Model school, in 1850 (Q. 12610). Not one of these five documents was obtained by any order of the Commission, but were all obtained, either the originals or copies, by a private member of the Commission. I have no further observation to make now on the subject.

12629. Under the early protective rules, what were the practical safeguards for religious minorities in National schools?—Do you mean as to official forms or as to rules?

12630. As to rules?—As to rules—that no child should be compelled to receive, or should even be present at any religious instruction not previously approved of by its parent or guardian—and under this rule, the parent guaranteed to the Board, when he obtained the grant, that he would require his teachers to, or should himself, if necessary, physically and bodily exclude such child, from the school, during the time of separate adverse religious instruction.

12631. At that period did they keep a register of the creed of the children in the school?—No.

12632. When was the register introduced?—It was drawn up in 1853, but not brought into operation, in the schools, until 1st April, 1855.

12633. Was there any objection made to such a registration previous to that?—A great objection was made by the Commissioners, themselves.

12634. What reasons did they assign?—We respect to that portion of the Order requiring the number of children—distinguishing Protestant and Catholic, we are directed by his Grace the Duke of Leinster to state, that if such account had been required to be kept, he would have declined to accept the office of President of the Board, on such terms."

12635. From what have you read that passage?—From a letter of the Commissioners of National Education, signed Maurice Cross, Hamilton Dowdall, Secretaries, dated 4th July, 1852, addressed to Lord Morpeth.

12636. On what occasion was that letter addressed to Lord Morpeth?—Explaining, through him, as Chief Secretary for Ireland, to the House of Commons why it was the Commissioners refused to supply a creed return, or keep any such religious register.

12637. The Chairman.—Will you give the date and number of the parliamentary return to which you refer?—No. 429, Session, 1853.

12638. Mr. Sullivan.—Who moved for that creed return?—The late Mr. Henry Gavan, &c.

12639. Was that the first creed return moved for in connection with National education?—The first in the Commons, but one had been previously moved for, in the Lords. You will allow me to add, that, in the paragraph following the one which I have quoted, a similar statement is made in reference to the other original members then remaining on the Board, all of whom—the Most Rev. Dr. Whately, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, the Rev. Dr. Sadler, Mr. Elkin, Mr. Holmes, all, save the Rev. Mr. Carile—were then Com-

Nov 28 1886.

JAMES W. KAVANAGH,  
R. 108, 125, 1  
290

Nov 26, 1868  
James Wm  
Kearney,  
esq.

missioners, so that it committed six out of seven of the original Commissioners to this opinion and statement.

19340 Have many other religious returns been noted for since?—Several. One, ordered by the late Earl of Eglinton, (1859), known as the "Eglinton Returns;" another, through the present Earl of Clanawry, (1852), known by his name, also; another, known as the "Brett Returns," (No. 105—1861), moved for by Mr. Brett, when member of Parliament; another, known as the "Merrill Returns," (No. 148—1859), moved for by the Right Hon. W. Mansell; and Major O'Reilly's great returns, (No. 481—1864).

19341 Any others?—These, I think, are almost all. Some other summary returns, but not so detailed as the ones to which I have alluded, have, from time to time, been moved for.

19342 Mr. Stokes.—Was it not part of the original scheme of the Board that the attendance of children at Sunday-school should be recorded and registered in the same way?—More than at Sunday-school—at Divine Service—which could not be done without keeping a creed register, but the Protestant Commissioners objected to it a few months after wards, and it had to be struck out. The Catholic members assented to it, but the Protestant members refused, on conscientious grounds.

19343 Mr. Seddons.—I think you stated that the creed registration was first introduced in 1850. To what use has it been applied?—It was not introduced quite voluntarily. After the inquiry of 1854 there were instructions sent by the then Government. Lord Granville was the Chairman of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, and founded on those instructions was a creed return, and I am the person that drew up the school register in which the creed return comes, and the instructions for keeping it.\*

19344 Could you point out the several changes that took place in the form of Register, and in the time of the notification of religious instruction on the time-tables of the schools after their introduction?—About the year 1853 there was a sheet introduced called "SCHOOL RULES"—a very inaccurate name, as it was a mere Horarium, or Time Table, of the school, and not Rules. At that time, the division of the classes was rude and simple, and on these rules, or more properly time-tables, was entered the extent of time—one entire day in the week, and say half an hour or quarter of an hour each other day—when religious instruction was given, either before or after, or both before and after secular instruction. As the development of the system went on, it was found that this vague notification of time was not specific enough, and a revision was recommended by the change in the rules, in autumn, 1857, made at the instance of the Presbyterians, consequent on the inquiry that had just been held in Parliament.

19345 That change was the heading of secular instruction by religious instruction—was it not?—Exactly. They said that to have the daily religious instruction before or after school only was a virtual exclusion of the Word of God from the school-house proper, and, for the first time, they were allowed to break the secular instruction code, in each day. Then it became necessary, when religious instruction was in the school, to be specific in notifying, on the sheet, the precise time when the religious instruction began and when it closed. So you may take those as the next changes.

19346 And when was the tablet "RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTIONS" introduced?—March, 1859.

19347 Why was it introduced, and how was it used?—It was found that complaints were arising, especially on the part of Roman Catholics, consequent on the great change that had taken place—what I call the Stayfield change—in November, 1847. The Catholics began to complain, and then these changes followed, according as complaints grew louder and louder.

19348 Did any circumstance occurring at that time lead to increased apprehension of proselytism in the schools?—Yes; as soon as the change of November,

1847, upon which I have already been examined, became known, which it did not, fully, for two years, till about the year 1850, the Catholic bishops and Catholic clergy became intensely alarmed, and then those various devices, including notice by ringing a bell, oral notice to assemblies, and an interval of a few minutes between the secular and the Religious Instruction, were introduced. In the Council of Thurles that was held in 1850, the matter was brought forward, when the following Decree, under the head "National Schools," was passed by the Catholic hierarchy, and confirmed by the Pope in 1851, and therefore became binding on the conscience of all Catholics in Ireland. Permit me to read the Decree.

19349 Did they suggest any way for meeting the difficulty?—Yes, but it was not carried out for five years after this, until early in 1856.

19350 But was it a special provision that they suggested?—A provision, while tolerating mixed education, so long as it would last, not approving, but tolerating it.

19351 Now will you read the Decree?—(Reads).—

"In every school frequented by Catholics, let there be kept a book in which shall be entered those names and religions, and let the schoolmaster be bound to see that no Catholic be present at any religious exercise conducted by a Protestant minister, or by any other person, whatsoever, not approved by the Catholic pastor, and let it be the business of the pastor, or of the priest, to watch lest anything contrary to the Catholic religion take place, in schools of this kind. And, in case that he shall discover anything of the kind, or be aware of the teaching or the mode of acting of those who are at the head of these schools, about which he will deem it fit to complain to the Board, it is quite necessary that they should ascertain his complaint, so that of the spiritual father of the people."

19352 Well, subsequent to that, at what period was the Notice System introduced?—In December, 1855, after the revocations of proselytising practices, in 1854, before the House of Lords Committee, and the disapproval of the principle of the National system, by the Catholic bishops, in the Council of Thurles, in 1850.

19353 Was this Notice System opposed?—Yes.

19354 When?—By the Presbyterians, in Ulster.

If the Notice has not been already given in evidence, will you allow me to put it in, as an official form.

19355 Read the Notice?—The Notice is printed, after the manner of a bank cheque-book. The Notice book is like a bank cheque-book, the black copy, or counterfoil remaining behind, after the Notice is torn off. I will read the Notice only, the black being the same?—

"No."

"Notice to Parents and Guardians.—National school. — is informed, in compliance with the instructions contained in Rule 10, Section 4, Part I. of the Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners, that — attended the Religious Instruction given by me, on the — day of — 18—, at the time set apart for Religious Instruction, in the above school, this being — first attendance.

(Signature). — Teacher.

"— day of — 18—."

The block, remaining on the left-hand side, corresponds to the Notice.

19356 You have said that it was opposed by the Presbyterians?—Yes.

19357 What evidence have you to show that they did so?—Some of the Presbyterians opposed it, in fact, on the ground that it was a departure from the principle on which they connected themselves with the Board, but others, while accepting it, under protest, objected to giving the Notice system a retrospective effect, and I will read for you the Order of the Board on this head. One Inspector in particular, Mr. Graham, of Londonderry, rather a Presbyterianist, represented to the Board the argument of the Presbyterians. I do not mean to say that other action was not also taken, but I tell you what was within my own knowledge, that Mr. Graham did especially put it forward, as a breach of faith with the Presbyterians, and a grievance, that the Notice should have a retrospective effect—that is his complaint—with respect to children already in school. The Commissioners recognised the force of this objection, and made an Order on it, which,

\* The Form of School Register, with instructions for keeping same, will be found among the Returns, &c., furnished by the National Board.



if you please, I will read for you. Will you allow me to read the Circular sending out the forms of Notice first, and then to read the Order.

19318. Yes!—(Reads).—

"CIRCULAR TO ALL INSPECTORS

"16 December, 1859.

"As directed to you by my Circular of the 23rd of August last, you forward to your Depot copies of the forms of Notice and Instructions to teachers relating thereto, and of whose nature you have been already informed.

(Signed) "HARRIS CHASE,  
"JAMES KELLY."

Now, for the Order of the Board.—

"CIRCULAR TO ALL INSPECTORS.

"24th January, 1860.

"With reference to the Notice for Parents lately issued, regarding attendance at Religious Instruction by pupils of National Schools, we are to inform you that this Notice applies only to children who, for the first time, shall attend religious instruction by a teacher of a different faith from their own. After the supply of Notices shall have been exhausted by this, and it, we must in reply to those children who, up to that period, shall have attended such instruction.

(Signed) "HARRIS CHASE,  
"JAMES KELLY."

19319. That was a modification made in the rule of 1855?—Yes.

19320. How did the rule in its modified form operate?—The best way that you can understand how it operated is to take the O'Reilly Returns for Ulster, from a summary of which it appears that in 579 National schools, within the single year 1855, the parents of 4,496 Catholic children, in Protestant or Presbyterian schools, received, or at least were said to have been said to receive, information that their children had attended adverse religious instruction (for the first time, recollect) that year; whilst in those 579 schools there were on the roll, that year, a total of 11,435 Catholic children, so that the parents of all the other 7,939 children may have received Notice previously, because the terms are strict, attended religious instruction "for the first time."

19321. What view did the Inspectors take of the rule?—The Head Inspector of Ulster, Mr. Keenan, who entered upon office early in 1855, the year that it came into operation, wrote a report in 1856 giving an account of the failure of the existing rules to protect minorities, which portion was struck out of his general report, but the omitted passages were ordered by Parliament, and you have them already in my evidence on a previous day.

19322. Did the Board of Education itself express any confident opinion as to the effectiveness of the rule for attaining the object they had in view when this Notice was sent?—A remarkable feature in the Board's Reports is that they never made a change which relaxed the original fair rules with regard to protecting minorities, that they did not accompany it by a statement that they believed that no evil would arise from the change. In the Report for 1859, they expressed more than an opinion—they ordered an Inquiry; they got returns from all their Inspectors, and I may say, without any question, that the passage is merely replying to my book, "The Catholic Case Stated." I will read the passage from the text of their own report for 1859. It is section 15 of the Board's Report for that year.—

"It has been stated that great numbers, amounting to as many as 70,000 Roman Catholic children, attending National schools of which the patrons are Protestants, are in the habit of attending Scriptural classes in these schools, under Protestant teachers. We have therefore made full inquiry into this matter, and we have ascertained, first, that there are 1,250 National schools under Protestant patronage, and attended by 50,581 Roman Catholic pupils, second, that of the 1,361 schools there are 448 attended by 25,682 Roman Catholic pupils, in which the Protestant patrons appoint Roman Catholics as the teachers, third, that of the 36,194 Roman Catholic children, 1,615 passed in the Scriptural classes under Protestant teachers. We have also found that 600 Roman Catholic children, passed during the year religious instruction, in reading our Scripture Extracts and book of Sacred Poetry under Protestant teachers, and that three Roman Catholics, at the instance of these mothers and guardians respectively, who were Protestants, received instruction under Protestant teachers in the Protestant catechisms. We have issued a Circular, directing our Inspectors in all cases where they find children of one faith receiving religious instruction from teachers of another faith, to use the utmost vigilance to discover whether any contravention or subversion, contrary to our fundamental rule on this subject, has been used to cause these children to be present at such religious instruction."

19323. Was the quotation which you gave respecting the O'Reilly returns a few moments ago, from an analysis of those returns?—An analysis carefully made by me; and I may mention to you that I replied to the statement in the Board's Report, for 1859, just read, by drafting the notice of motion calling for the O'Reilly returns the results in which were obtained from the patrons and the teachers of the schools, through the Commissioners, and laid before the House of Commons; and I now leave this Commission and the public to compare the two statements.

19324. Will you put it in?—I now put the Table in evidence.

ANALYTIC SUMMARY of the "O'REILLY RETURNS—1855"

Governor.	No. of Schools in Operation this Year, ended 31st Dec- ember, 1855.	Classification of National Schools, according to the Creed of the																Religious Instruction Impaired.			
		Protestant					Teacher			Pupils											
		R.C.	E.C.	Pres.	Other	Others	R.C.	Pro-Testant	Joint	All R.C.	All Pro-Testant.	Joint.	R.C. only.	Pro-Testant only.	Both R.C. and Pres.	None of the above.					
Antrim, . . .	408	75	56	222	28	21	90	206	19	13	75	408	96	311	19	60					
Down, . . .	356	85	55	191	5	10	103	241	7	15	46	253	85	216	82	32					
Londonderry, . . .	305	58	36	98	5	4	64	132	6	5	6	178	50	112	32	11					
Tyrone, . . .	392	129	67	86	10	10	170	119	8	56	2	256	79	80	113	25					
Armagh, . . .	181	75	41	36	5	12	65	95	7	18	2	160	67	77	8	29					
Fermanagh, . . .	132	73	35	15	—	9	55	52	1	7	5	118	35	32	6	8					
Monaghan, . . .	131	67	35	22	7	—	58	47	5	16	2	131	35	37	19	6					
Dougal, . . .	352	142	76	95	0	5	165	91	3	20	1	227	132	77	40	23					
Cavan, . . .	233	158	34	15	7	2	212	18	2	58	—	174	165	16	26	5					
Ulster, . . .	2,338	632	418	629	69	75	1,038	1,161	58	191	157	1,948	783	567	550	120					
Lancaster, . . .	1,478	1,276	104	6	80	18	1,496	38	32	890	9	617	1,343	21	75	35					
Meath, . . .	1,455	1,229	64	5	74	28	1,445	22	15	953	5	516	1,495	17	27	49					
Connaught, . . .	313	741	119	9	33	11	869	87	7	395	3	444	923	27	31	32					
Total, . . .	6,216	4,267	719	649	256	125	6,619	1,259	116	2,890	134	3,535	4,354	1,032	524	306					

## FACILITATING PRACTICE.—The "Noter" System. (Part I., Section IV., Rules 16 and 17.)

Nov. 26, 1886.

JAMES Wm  
KARNEY,  
esq.

County.	Against Catholic Pupils						Against Protestant Pupils.			
	Noted against Catholic Parents			Signatures, Antisocial Pupils, and by Catholics.		Signatures, or other Admissions of Parents living		Noted against Protestant Parents.		
	No. of Schools.	Noters.	Catholic Pupils as Noted	No. of Noters.	Catholic Pupils.	No. of Schools.	Catholic Pupils as Noted	No. of Schools.	Noters.	Protestant Pupils as Noted
Antrim.	189	1,346	2,669	43	314	503	3,138	40	840	943
Down.	131	767	1,919	63	275	139	9,658	14	169	438
Londonderry.	69	532	1,429	36	332	77	1,327	22	172	632
Tyrone.	59	560	1,526	23	116	62	1,658	17	694	2,572
Armagh.	45	278	913	21	166	47	800	13	68	77
Fermanagh.	16	135	377	—	—	14	377	31	528	1,468
Monaghan.	20	219	639	—	—	20	629	21	175	593
Donegal.	45	482	1,361	9	56	47	1,594	37	345	777
Cavan.	5	107	132	—	—	5	132	44	348	933
County.	479	4,406	11,615	193	1,380	618	12,222	319	2,392	7,731
Larne.	5	23	84	3	19	—	—	71	329	464
Monaghan.	4	14	21	—	—	4	21	81	175	259
Cavanagh.	7	47	156	3	8	—	—	30	309	365
Total.	595	4,492	12,278	201	1,357	622	12,243	461	3,315	8,948

19365. What effect had the publication of the O'Reilly returns?—The effect of it on the Government was publicly manifested. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Right Hon. Charles Stewart Parnell, upon its being presented in the House of Commons by Major O'Reilly, 15th May, 1886, said, in effect—"Is this the system that Lord Stanley offered to the Irish people in 1831? Is this the system from which was to be hatched even the suspicion of proselytism? Clearly it is a sham, and no people should submit to it." And the upshot of it was that the Board were obliged to return, in a modified form, the old rule in force from 1831 to 1848.

19366. What action did the Government take?—They intimated to the Board that they should return to the old rule.

19367. Will you explain this new rule?—When the original rule was in operation, from 1831 to 1848, the pupils were without any religious regulation whatever, during which the parent was obliged to compound or physically exclude religious instruction; but when the Board came to restore the old rule in May, 1886, they had a religious regulation before them, and passed the following rule, which I will read to you from the code of 1846—

"No Pupil who is registered by its Parents or Guardians as a Protestant is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction, it is the duty of the Teacher giving such instruction, in a Roman Catholic, and no Pupil who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Roman Catholic, is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction, in a Protestant giving such instruction, it is not a Roman Catholic. And, further, no Pupil is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of any religious instruction to which its Parents or Guardians object."

19368. The Chairman.—Is that the existing rule?—Part of the existing rule, my lord.

19369. Mr. Sullivan.—Did any of the Commissioners themselves oppose the change?—Yes; the Presbyterian element on the Board.

19370. What evidence have you that any of the Commissioners opposed the change?—In Parliamentary Paper (House of Commons, No. 407—1886), I find, under the head of the Commissioners who were present at it—Shall I read the names of all present, or only the names of those who protested.

19371. Read the names of those who protested?—"The Rev. Dr. Henry" (I am reading from the Paper), "the Rev. Dr. Hall, and James Gilson, esq., protested against the change of rule." "Note (under the same head), the Bishop of Derry, in a letter addressed by him to the Board, expressed himself prepared to assent to a change of the rule, and with that view his lordship submitted a proposition which, however, was not adopted by the Commissioners." I have just read

the head exactly as it is, in the Parliamentary Paper. The Paper I read from was moved for by Sir Hugh Cairns, then Member for Belfast.

19372. Did any religious body oppose it?—Yes; the Presbyterian General Assembly. There is a body called the Elementary Education Committee, of the General Assembly, of which some of the Commissioners of National Education are also members. The three Presbyterian Commissioners opposed the change of rule at the Board, while the Elementary School Committee got up a meeting, headed by deputation on Lord Wodehouse, the late Lord Lonsdale, 18th June, 1886, and complained of this change.

19373. What was the result?—The Lord Lieutenant, by Right Hon. C. Fortescue's letter, dated 19th June, approved of that rule, on condition that the Commissioners annex thereto a rider, or proviso, which would nullify its whole action.

19374. Will you read that rider, please?—(Reads):—

"Provided, however, that in case any Parent or Guardian shall express his desire that his Child should receive any particular religious instruction, and shall record such desire in a book, to be provided in the School, when necessary, for that purpose, the prohibition shall not apply to the time during which such religious instruction only is given. . . . The entry in the book shall be signed with the name, or mark, of the Parent or Guardian, and the book shall be submitted to the Inspector so often as he visits the school. . . . Such expression of desire may at any time be revoked by the Parent or Guardian, and shall, therefore, become inoperative."

19375. Did the Commissioners, as a body, acquiesce in that rider?—Reluctantly; informing the Lord Lieutenant, by Minute of 22nd June, 1886, that they might feel bound to reconsider the matter and remove the rider.

19376. Did you take any action with reference to that change of rule?—On being consulted by some of the Catholic bishops, I told them that the rider, or proviso, would simply negative the rule, that the only proviso was the Post-law statute, which protects the juvenile pauper, and that the caterpillar's child in a primary school should have at least the same protection for his faith which the pauper's child has in a Workhouse, or the juvenile delinquent in a Reformatory.

19377. The Chairman.—Can you give the name of that Act, the chapter, and the section?—The 1st and 2nd of Victoria, chap. 36, section 49—

"And both meant that no Order of the Commissioners, nor any by-law, shall oblige any tenets of any workhouse to attend, or be present at, any religious service which may be conducted in a mode contrary to the religious principles of such tenets; nor shall authorize the admission of any child in such workhouse, in any religious creed other than that professed by the parents, or surviving parents, of such child, and to which such parents, or parent, shall object, or, in the case of an orphan, to which the guardian, or guardians, godfather, or godmother, of such orphan shall object; provided, also, that it shall be lawful for any regular minister, of the religious persuasion of any tenets of such workhouse, at all times

in the day, on the request of such inmate, to visit such workhouse, for the purpose of affording religious assistance to such inmate, and also for the purpose of instructing the child, or children, in the principles of his religion."

19375 Mr. Sullivan.—Did you take any public action in view of that change?—Some of the Catholic bishops were so kind as to consult me with regard to the efficacy of the amended rule, I told them, from my intimate knowledge of the practical details of schools, that it would not work, and that the Presbyterian people negatived the rule. Finding that some of their lordships misunderstood me, I felt it my constitutional duty, in the face of this, to write a public letter, above my own name, addressed to the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, warning them of what would occur with regard to the rule.

19379. I think, in your former evidence, you expressed a very confident opinion that the rule would not be observed?—Yes.

19380 And that you proposed to visit the north of Ireland, for the purpose of ascertaining if this had been the effect?—I stated before this Commission, that if I were spared till you should meet again, I would do so, and I have fulfilled that promise.

19381 What counties did you visit?—Down, Antrim, Anson, Londonderry, Donagall, Tyrone, and the City of Dublin.

19382 Under what patronage are the schools that you visited?—All sorts of patronage, public and private, and of every denomination, but my attention was chiefly directed, I must say, to schools under Presbyterian patronage, to model schools, and also to workhouse schools. I visited altogether, including schools about which I inquired only, about 300 schools, on that special tour.

19383 Now, how far do those, as to the number and class of school, and kind of patronage, represent the average of the schools?—Fairly and fully represent the whole state of the north of Ireland—that is the North East of Ireland, the Protestant District, because, as I remarked before, it is there that religious differences most abound, and that Catholics most need protection.

19384 Will you submit a copy of the new Certificate Book?—Yes, I beg to hand it in—a copy of the Certificate Book of Religious Instruction, framed under the Proviso of the New Rule of 1866—

Sole No. — School, — County, —  
Name of Teacher who gives Religious Instruction, —  
Religious Denominations of do., —

#### CERTIFICATE OF PARENT OR GUARDIAN.

[In case a Parent or Guardian should wish his Child to receive religious instruction from a Teacher whose of a different religious denomination from the Child, or from a Teacher who gives any religious instruction different from that which is in accordance with the creed of the Child, the following Certificate is to be made by such Parent or Guardian.]

I (1) —, being the (2) —, of (3) —, who is registered by me as (4) —, in the School district of the (5) — National School, hereby declare that it is my desire that the said (6) — shall receive instruction in (7) — during the time allotted for Religious Instruction.

Signature of Parent or Guardian (8) —

Witness, if signed by "mark," —

Dated — day of —, 18—.

#### CERTIFICATE OF TEACHER.

I HEREBY declare that before (9) — signed the above Certificate I read aloud to (10) — the following Rule of the Commissioners of National Education:—

"No Pupil who is registered by its Parents or Guardians as Protestant is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction in a case the Teacher giving such instruction is a Roman Catholic; and as Pupil who is registered by its Parents or Guardians as a Roman Catholic is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction in a case the Teacher giving such instruction is a Roman Catholic. And further, no Pupil is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of any religious instruction to which its Parents or Guardians object."

I provided, however, that in case any Parent or Guardian should express his desire that his Child should receive any particular religious instruction, and should send such desire in a Book to be provided in the School, when necessary for that purpose, this prohibition shall not apply to the time during

which such religious instruction only is given. The entry in the Book shall be signed with the name or mark of the Parent or Guardian, and the Book shall be submitted to the Inspector so often as to be seen by the school.

"Such expression of desire may at any time be revoked by the Parent or Guardian, and shall thereupon become inoperative."—Part I, Sec. IV, Para. 15.

And I further declare that I believe when the said (11) — signed the above Certificate (12) — had a full apprehension of the meaning and force of the Rule, and also of the treatment and object of the Certificate.

Signature of Teacher, —

Dated — day of —, 18—.

#### CERTIFICATE OF INSPECTOR.

I HEREBY declare that I have examined the Certificate of (13) — and also of the Teacher (14) — above set forth, and that I am satisfied as to the genuineness of each.

Signature of Inspector —

Dated — day of —, 18—.

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILING BY THE CERTIFICATE.

(1) Insert the name of the Parent or Guardian who makes the Certificate.

(2) Insert the relationship of the Parent or Guardian; as,— "Father," "Mother," "Aunt," &c.

(3) Insert the name of the Pupil.

(4) Insert the religious religion of the Pupil.

(5) Insert the name of the National School.

(6) Insert the name of the Parish agent.

(7) Insert, in full, the nature of the Religious Instruction:— as—The Holy Scriptures in the Authorized Version—The Roman Catholic Catechism—The Protestant Catechism, &c., &c. This is to be written by the parent or guardian; but in case the Parent or Guardian cannot write, it is to be written by the Teacher.

(8) The Parent or Guardian is here to insert his name. If the Parent or Guardian be unable to write his name, he is to sign or mark, but this mark must be witnessed by some responsible third party.

(9) Insert the name of the Parent or Guardian.

(10) Insert "his" or "her."

(11) Insert the name of the Parent or Guardian.

(12) Insert "he" or "she."

(13) Insert the name of the Parent or Guardian.

(14) Insert the name of the Teacher.

19385. What was the date of introduction of that form?—The close of 1866 and the beginning of 1867.

19386. Did the National Board issue any Minute or any instructions explaining its object?—Yes, an Explanatory Minute, and, I must add, a very fair explanation.

19387. Will you read the Minute?—It is a Minute of the Board explaining the object, as they were starting this new arrangement—a minute of the Board, dated 26th of February, 1867, Explanatory of the New Rule as to attendance of pupils of National schools at Religious Instruction, Parts I and IV, Rule 15—

"The object of the Rule is more fully to carry out the general principle of the Board, that no child is to receive any religious instruction contrary to the wishes of its parent. Accordingly, the rule last provides for the case where the teacher is Protestant and the child Roman Catholic, or vice versa. In this case, the dissent of the parent is required, and no religious instruction can be given to a child by a teacher of a different creed, unless the parent expressly requests it. But where the teacher and the child are both Protestants, whether of the same or of a different denomination, the dissent of the parent will not be implied. In this case religious instruction can be given to the child, unless the parent expressly forbids it. In such case, however, the dissent or dissent, whether implied or expressed, can be modified by the entry, duly signed by the parent, in the Certificate-book of Religious Instruction. Cases may occur in which the conduct of the teachers, although not coming within the strict letter of the new Rule, is obviously contrary to the general spirit of the National system—on, for instance, if instruction should be given in the children or creed of a different persuasion from that of the child." This is the Board's explanation starting the new rule. A copy of it was transmitted to every person in Ireland, and this document is expected to be retained in the school.

19388. Mr. Gilson.—Are you aware that, until the recent change by that rule in 1866 and 1867, it was the received construction upon the rule of the Board, as to the religious instruction, that the parent was not obliged to expel a child from the school?—You are quite right, but only between 1847 and 1866, the latter half of the last thirty-five years of the system.

Nov. 29, 1885

James Wm. Kennaugh,  
esq.

Nov. 25, 1868

James Wm. Kennaugh, esq.

19383. The principle acted upon by the Board up to that time was this, that there should be no compulsion of attendance, and no exclusion from the school?—No, that is only true to a certain extent to the period between November 1847 and 1868.

19386. Did any Protestant denomination ever occur in the interpretation that it was incumbent upon them to expel a Roman Catholic child from the school?—Everyone, denomination and individual, that ever joined the Board up to 1847 was bound to do, and did so so.

19391. Did not the Board lay it down, authoritatively, that a patron was not obliged to expel a child from a school in which the parent whose duty it was to expel it, if necessary, sent it?—Pardon me, Mr. Gibson, you are quite inaccurate. That is correct from 1847 up to 1868; but wholly inaccurate, as I will prove, as to the previous sixteen years.

19392. From the time that the Presbyterian body joined the Board in 1840 until 1868, the construction invariably put upon the rule of the Board for religious instruction, as the condition on which they joined, was, that it devolved upon the parent to withhold his child from religious instruction of which he disapproved, but that the patron should not compel any child to attend or to be present at such religious instruction. Do you contradict that statement?—Distinctly.

19393. Rev. Dr. Wilson—You have referred to certain documents which were submitted to you by me on various occasions. Of one of those you had not a copy then?—Yes, I had copies of none of them. But, I dare say, it is to my letter against the *Enniscorthy Model School*, 29th August, 1856, that you refer. Of that I had no copy, then.

19394. May I ask had you not a copy in your possession at the time you were under examination here on the 11th of July, 1868?—No.

19395. Had you looked it up previously?—I tried for it, most carefully, and found I had no copy.

19396. Have you any objection to say how it turned up?—I have already stated it in evidence, but I will repeat it for you. In the first place, with regard to the earlier part of your question, it is quite clear that if I had it in my possession before my examination, I would not have applied to this Commission for an order to get a copy of it from the Board, which order was freely given by the Chairman. That is a sufficient answer to that part of the question. With regard to the next, no one could suppose that I would deny that I had a copy of it, or that I would not make due search for it, when I intended to use that document in my own vindication. And, lastly, as to how it turned up, the passage cited by you (*Q* 13665), turned up most strangely. It occurs in the middle of a letter on the *Enniscorthy model school*, while the *Enniscorthy model school* is never referred to, directly or indirectly, in the passage cited by you. You omitted even where I was living, Greystones, Delgany, on it being a model school, the place might have rounded me of the subject, and it was some time before the possibility occurred to my mind that it might refer to my *Enniscorthy* letter. I then searched the files of the *Free-press's Journal*, in the year 1862, for copies of two letters to Basil Clarke, giving an account of the visit I made to the *Enniscorthy model school*, as being the subject, it was most that I should be the historian of its failure. I applied to the Board, just before I visited *Enniscorthy*, for a copy of my letter, which they gave me. And now you can better understand how it was that my memory was refreshed on the point, and how the copy of the missing letter turned up.

19397. Now, did you not previously refer to that letter, written at Greystones, in the course of your examination?—I may or may not have done so.

19398. Did you, or did you not?—I cannot say, the evidence will tell.

19399. Did you not recognise the connection between what I read and the previous part of the letter, as portion of the communication which you wrote at Greystones?—I did not. For many days after my

examination in July last, I was ignorant of the letter to which your extract might refer, and at length conjecturing that it might form part of the *Enniscorthy* letter, I went, as a dernier ressort, to search the *Free-press's Journal* for a copy.

19400. Now, Mr. Gibson has asked you a question as to the period from 1849 to 1868. Was it not understood that it devolved on the parent to withhold his child from religious instruction of which he did not approve?—You have answered that question?—I have, in the negative.

19401. I now ask you, previous to the year 1840 did it not devolve upon the parent to withhold his child from religious instruction of which he did not approve?—No, not subsequently to 1840 not until the year 1843, for, like many other vague questions, portion of Mr. Gibson's statement is correct, and another portion incorrect, with regard to dates. But I confined myself to giving a firm answer to it, that he was decidedly in error when he states, that, from 1840 up to 1855, patrons were not bound to exclude religious minorities from adverse religious instruction.

19402. Now, may I ask you as to the change that took place in 1847—in one word, what was the change made in the rule in 1847?—Literally, the answer to your question is, the introduction of the phrase "to" into the rule—as you must have literal answers.

19403. A mere verbal change?—The word "Not," a mere verbal change, would, you will admit, alter, totally, any of the Ten Commandments, or an Act of Parliament.

19404. Will you turn to the Report of the Commissioners for the year 1847—volume ii, page 70, and read what they say?—(Reads).—

"Our Secretaries having informed us that they had been frequently consulted, both personally and by letter, as to the true meaning of the following portion of Section 5, Paragraph 3, of the Report of the Board with reference to religious instruction:—'that the regard be had to parental right and authority; that, accordingly, no child be compelled to receive, or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object,' and that they deemed it desirable that we should supply them with an authoritative answer to such questions," we directed them, by a Minute bearing date 18th Nov., 1847, to give the following explanation in reply to all such inquiries, as follows:—'First, That the true interpretation of the words in question clearly is, that no child be compelled to receive, or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object, and that this rule, in accordance with the regulation in the school-order of the corresponding for giving religious instruction as required by Article 8, section 5, has, hitherto, been found amply enforced for the full enforcement of parental authority; Secondly, that, though all that is required by this rule, section 3, paragraph 3, is that the Patron should engage not to compel any child to be present at such religious instruction; yet, should the Patron too any means, either directly or indirectly, to induce any child to attend such religious instruction contrary to the desire of its parents or guardians, the Commissioners would consider such conduct inconsistent with the whole spirit of their system. That it was with a view to guard against the possibility of such a case arising that the Commissioners gave the following important explanation of their sentiments in their 10th Report, for the year 1844, dated the 24th day of April, 1845."

19405. That will do. Now, I ask you, having read that, in opposition to the view you entertain, and the interpretation you give, was not the rule one of non-compulsion as to attendance, and non-compulsion as to exclusion?—The passage that I have quoted for you proves my case, instead of disproving it.

19406. First, as to the words of the rule itself, I ask what interpretation do you make there?—A prospective interpretation, and not retrospective; and, therefore, as evidence whatever, either for you or Mr. Gibson.

19407. Now, suppose that the meaning was "that no child be compelled to receive, or be permitted to be present," would not in that case the clause "compelled to receive" be worse than useless—would it not be absurd?—I cannot say. I will give no opinion about that, but I will tell you what the Board thought about it.

19408. I want your opinion?—I decline to give any opinion. There is no use taking up the time of the Commission.

19409. Now, if a child were not permitted to be

Nov. 26, 1868.  
James Wm.  
Kerrington,  
esq.

present at the religious instruction, could there be any danger of his being compelled to receive it? Answer the question!—I decline to answer it, but must respectfully. It does not arise, I assure you, from any want of respect for you or the Commission.

19410. In that case would not the rule have been that no child should be permitted to receive or to be present at the religious instruction?—If you will allow me, Dr. Wilson, I will tell you the circumstances—

19411. Answer the question!—I beg, once and for all, respectfully to decline giving any opinion of my own, outside the facts with which I am perfectly conversant, but if permitted, I will tell you the circumstances that led to this new interpretation, which I think is far more interesting and important.

19412. Then you refuse to give a categorical answer to my question!—I decline to give my own opinion.

19413. Now, do you not think that the rule was framed to show that the child was to be permitted to receive and to be present at religious instruction, but not to be compelled to be present at it?—I am absolutely certain (and I was an officer of the Board, in high position with the Commissioners, and acquainted with their objects and motives) that it was framed and designed with the distinct object of preventing a child from receiving, and even excluding a child from being present at adverse religious instruction—and that that was its sole and proper object.

19414. Was not the rule framed in view of what was extraordinary—children of other denominations being present in another part of the room, during the time that a different religious instruction was being given, without being required to be present at or take part in it?—I know, so far as my official experience goes, that there was no such custom, and if there had been such a custom, it was a violation of the rules of the Board. Instead of such a custom being permitted, when the Presbyterians joined the Board in 1849, in a report written by the right hand of Anthony Richard Blake—I will produce his words—the Presbyterians were warned that no change was made in this rule, and the Temple Meeting-house Board's order of 1853, telling them that it was of the essence of the Board's rules, that the patron should exclude the children of nonpatrons from adverse religious instruction was re-produced.

19415. Was not that rule laid down with regard to such a case in the Temple school-house, to which you have referred, that there should not even be compulsion to this extent, requiring the children to stay as to be present in a different part of the room while religious instruction was going on?—The terms of the letter are so distinct that anyone who can understand the Second Book of Lessons of the National Board, anyone who knows the meaning of the homolot, English can understand it. Mr. Blake wrote the Temple Meeting-house school letter in 1853. When the patron of that school, the Rev. Mr. Love, implied that it was indifferent to him whether the minority remained or not, during adverse religious instruction, the Board told him that it was not indifferent to them, that it was of the essence of the rules that they should previously retire. When the Presbyterians joined in 1849, they were reminded of the same obligation, by reproducing the Temple Meeting-house letter of 1853, which, if the Commission will allow me to read it, will end the whole discussion.

19416. Was not compulsion the thing that was in view in the one case and in the other, and which was not to be permitted?—I do not understand the question.

19417. Now, to make this plain, is it not the fact that the word "compel" was invariably printed in italics?—Not invariably. I am obliged to you for reminding me of it. It was in the code adopted April, 1848, that the word "compelled" was first printed in italics.

19418. Now, I ask you again, was it not that no child should be compelled—keeping what I have

already stated in view, was not "compel" designed to apply both to "receive" and "be present at"?—No; there are two grammatical classes or logical propositions—one, "that no child be compelled to receive," the other, "or be present at any religious instruction," and it depends, entirely, on the ellipsis or otherwise of the word "to," whether the patron was not to compel them to go out, or whether he might not permit, so that he did not compel them to be present, and Archbishop Stopford's interpretation, or the change made, was the introduction of the word "to," so as to apply the word "compelled" to both classes of the sentence.

19419. Now, I ask with regard to the word "consent," to which you have already referred, with respect to the attendance of the inmates of workhouses at religious services, are the words "be present at" used with or without the word "to"?—I have already read the section of the Poor Law Act for the Chairman.

19420. Will you answer the question?—Is it a section of an Act of Parliament you want me to read?

19421. You cannot answer the question!—I beg your pardon. I appeal for protection to the chairman. If I am to be treated in this way I must decline to sit here under examination.

19422. Can you refer to the Act?—(Reads).—

"And be it enacted that no Order of the Commissioners, nor any bye-law, shall oblige any inmate of any workhouse to attend or be present at any religious service," &c.

19423. Is the word "to" there or not?—Yes; but, pardon me, the subject matter, religious instruction, is not the same. Religious instruction, we are considering, while this refers to public worship. Allow me to read the whole section, and I will answer your question fully and completely.

19424. Now, I ask you again, is it not used in such a connection that these classes must be in the indicative mood?—(Reads).—

"Nor shall any law or the objection of any child in such workhouse in any religious creed other than that professed by the parents or surviving parent of such child."

19425. (Question repeated).—They may or may not. The grammar admits of either of the two senses, and the two senses are totally different.

19426. Now, does not the word "obliged" in this case, in the Act of Parliament, correspond to the words "be compelled" in the other case?—I think not. One is "to attend" or "be present" at religious service, the other "to receive" or "be present" at religious instruction. But the child is protected in a subsequent part of the statute, which says that nothing shall authorize the education of the child in any religious creed other than that professed by its parent.

19427. Now, I ask, is not the interpretation of non-compulsion in the one case and non-exclusion in the other in harmony with the uniform practice of the Board, at least in non-vested schools?—No.

19428. Now, is it not in harmony with the language both employed by the Commissioners themselves invariably when setting forth the principles of the system?—In direct opposition to that language and those principles.

19429. Will you turn then to volume one of the Commissioners' reports, page 128, paragraph 36. I call your attention to the language of the Commissioners themselves in the year 1837. Turn to the Commissioners' report, volume one, page 128, paragraph 36. Shall I read it?

19430. Yes!—(Reads).—

"The principle of the system, and which we consider fundamental and unalterable, is, that the National Schools shall be open, alike, to Christians of all denominations, therefore, that no child shall be regarded as to be present at any religious instruction or exercise of which his parents or guardians may disapprove, and that opposition shall be afforded."

19431. That will do. You have "to be present" there, in what mood?—In the indicative mood.

19432. You do not regard "to be present" in that connection in the indicative mood, and compel with "required"—is that your answer?—The two phrases have no connection. You are mixing up the two, and

Nov. 25, 1895

James Wm  
Kearney,

they have no contention. They do not occur here at all.

19433. (Question repeated).—My answer is that Dr. Wilson asks me to compare the expression "that no child shall be compelled to receive or be present at," in the Rule, with the words here in the Report, "that no child shall be required to be present at," and there being no corresponding phrase here analogous in construction or sense to the other, I am totally at a loss to know what he means.

19434. Then do you refuse to answer my question?—I have stated my answer to it. I have quoted the two clauses you ask me to compare, and I am wholly at a loss to know your meaning.

19435. You know the Canon case?—Perfectly.

19436. Now, in the report for the year 1839, page 147, paragraph 21, is it not declared to be compatible with the principles of the National system?—Yes, but that comes in paragraph 29; in order to understand the question you will be good enough to read much more than you state or than you refer to.

19437. Will you read what the Commissioners say on that page, beginning with "No children are required," and so on?—Yes, with great pleasure. Before I do so, will you permit me to inform the Commission, which might escape attention, that there is an anachronism in the report. It purports to be the report for 1839, yet it refers to the junction of the Presbyterians in 1840, and if I did not mention this, confusion might arise. Now, I will read it for you. "The school," meaning the Canon typical applicant case.

19438. Begin where the Commissioners say "No children are required"?—No; pardon me, allow me to read the whole of the paragraph, or we cannot obtain the full and true meaning.—

"The school," (meaning the Canon case), "as your Reverendship will observe, is conducted by a Committee chosen by the parents of the children, the time for religious instruction is so arranged as not to interfere with the teaching or secular business of the school, no children are required to be present at it whose parents or guardians object to their being so, and such children are permitted to absent themselves, whenever their parents or guardians think fit, for the purpose of receiving such religious instruction as they may prefer for them. At this, in substance, agrees with the regulation of a school called the Temple Meeting-house School, to which we pointed out in 1839, after having explained our views, fully, in a letter, which has since been published with our Reports, and of which the following is a copy.—"

19439. Have you not?—I—Allow me, Dr. Wilson; there is no hope of obtaining the true sense without reading the entire letter. My lord, the letter is the whole story. The Commissioners want to show, in 1840, when they refer to Presbyterians.—

19440. I do not wish the time of the Commission to be usefully occupied?—Now, I appeal to any Commissioner.—

19441. Master Brooke.—Certainly, there is a passage of the letter, unmarked with asterisks, which is very important in the discussion?—Exactly; I wish to be most respectful, but the whole truth and marrow of the point, in dispute, is in the italicized passages, referred to by Master Brooke.

19442. There is a change in the italicized passage?—Purposefully italicized.

19443. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Now, in short, do not the Commissioners themselves say that "no children are required to be present at it," and "such children are permitted to absent themselves"?—In which paragraph?

19444. And does not all that agree with the regulations of the school called the Temple Meeting-house School?—The whole paragraph is but one, namely No. 21. One portion of it must explain the other, and I will read for you the explanation given by the Board. (Reads) "The rule"—

19445. I shall put a question to you to bring it out in another shape, as to affording a general opportunity for religious instruction. Read the statement on page 148, paragraph 23, from the middle of the paragraph?—I shall read it.

19446. If you please?—(Reads) —

"In the Temple Meeting-house School the time for religious instruction was from ten to three o'clock, but the particular time is immaterial, provided it be, as it is in the present case, so arranged as not to interfere with or impede the teaching or secular business of the school, and that no children shall be required to be present at it, whose parents or guardians object to their being so."

19447. Proceed with the next part?—(Reads) —

"Then, as to affording a general opportunity for religious instruction, children who did not take part in the religious exercises of the Temple Meeting-house School were allowed to absent themselves on Sunday for the purpose of receiving religious instruction elsewhere, and in the Canon school they are allowed to absent themselves for the same purpose, whenever their parents may direct them to do so."

19448. Yes; the children are allowed to absent themselves, for the same purpose, to receive religious instruction, a school, that is the language of the text. The Commissioners of National Education have made themselves responsible for that statement; will you now read on page 151 the names of the Commissioners?—With regard to the statement.—

19449. The names of the Commissioners on page 151?—If you allow me, I will read the names first. (Reads) —

"Messrs. Richard Dobson, Daniel Murray, Pease Sadler, Anthony Richard Blake, Robert Blake, Richard Wilson Greaves, Patrick Bellon, P. Shoolibane Henry, Mervill, Alexander Macdonald, John Richard Corbally, Phelan."

Now, allow me to show what is their meaning, because the passage, a portion only of which Dr. Wilson has quoted, my lord, is exactly in support of the view that I take of it.

19450. In the report for 1841, page 166, in the paragraph in which the disputed rule is given, read what the Commissioners say, commencing at the middle of the paragraph, "Provided that each school be open to permit children of all communions"?—(Reads) —

"Provided that each school be open to permit children of all communions—that day should be left to parental right and authority—Therefore, that no child be compelled to attend or be present at any religious instruction to which his Parents or Guardians object."

The same meaning.

19451. Proceed?—(Reads) —

"And that the time for giving it be so fixed that no child shall be thereby, in effect, excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the school affords."

19452. Proceed?—(Reads) —

"We may add, that in every part of the National Schools Religious Instruction is given, day by day, as it may be in all, if the Parents think proper, by extracts both of the Holy Scriptures and the approved Catechisms of the Church in which the children receiving it belong; but the times for reading the Holy Scriptures and for catechetical instruction are so arranged as not to interfere with or impede the teaching or secular business of the school, and no child, whose Parents or Guardians object, is required to be present, or take part in those exercises."

19453. Now, the words are "no child is required to be present or to take part"?—Yes.

19454. The language is not "is permitted to be present"?—No.

19455. Or is "to be present"?—No. It is "be present," absolutely, and not depending on <sup>5</sup> assent.

19456. Now, turn to the report for 1844, page 269, paragraph 32. Now, I ask you to read this paragraph which describes what the principle is and has been from the beginning; read the Commissioners' view?—(Reads) —

"The principle of it is, and has been from the beginning, that the National Schools shall be open alike to Christians of all denominations; and that, accordingly, no child shall be required to be present at any religious instruction or exercise of which his parents or guardians may disapprove; and that opportunities shall be afforded to all children to receive, separately, at particular periods, such religious instruction as their parents or guardians may prefer for them."

19457. Now, is not the language there "that no child shall be required to be present at any religious instruction"?—Yes; a portion of a larger truth, that no child shall be required to receive, and that no child shall be permitted to be present.

19458. Now, will you turn, if you please, to the report for the year 1845, page 325, and read as to the form of lease to be executed by parties granting a site, and state what are the words?—(Rowe).—

"And whereas the education of the Poor of Ireland has been hitherto and is now carried on by the said Commissioners, on the principle of avoiding all interference, whatsoever, with conscientious scruples, on the score of religion, and accordingly, the Schools under their control are open, alike to Children of all religious denominations, and no Child is required to be present at any religious instruction or exercise of which his Parents or Guardians may disapprove."

19459. Now, is not the language still the same—"no child is required to be present at"?—To the extent it goes; but it is not at all incompatible with the other clause. No way contradictory to or incompatible with the obligation to exclude.

19460. Now with regard to the form of lease on page 214, quote the words for me bearing upon the same subject. (Rowe).—

"It is the true intent and meaning of these Presents, that where any person of Religious Instruction is to be present in any such School, as aforesaid, during School-hours, to which the Parents or Guardians of any of the Children attending such School shall object, an arrangement shall be made for having such instruction given to those who are to receive it, at a stated time, and in a separate place, so as that no Children whose Parents or Guardians object to their being so, be present at it."

19461. Is not that the same language, showing the principle to be that the parents are the parties to object to their being present and to provide for their children accordingly?—So far as that goes; but it is not in any way incompatible with the other. And I have to remind you that immediately before this a distinction was made, in 1840, between vested and non-vested schools, and that the lease applies only to a vested school.

19462. Now, I ask your attention to the report for 1836—I bring you back to the report of the Commissioners for 1836?—I have considered a subsequent report, namely, 1839.

19463. But I wish you now to go back a little, to the report of 1836?—Certainly, with great pleasure.

19464. I wish you to read on page 112, query 7?—(Rowe).—

"What arrangement is made respecting the imparting of Religious Instruction to the Children? State particularly what day or days of the week are set apart for that purpose, and what hour or hours on any other day. State also whether public satisfaction is given at that arrangement, and whether or not parents are left at liberty to withhold their children from Religious Instruction which they do not approve of?"

19465. Now as early as the year 1836, was it not in view of the Commissioners of National Education, as it is plain on the face of that query sheet that it was the parents who were left at liberty to withhold their children from religious instruction which they did not approve of?—That was not the view of the Commissioners, and that question does not prove it. If you wish the view of the Commissioners I will give you their own evidence—that of Rev. Mr. Carile, the Presbyterian paid Commissioner, and of Mr. Blake, a Catholic, apart from that of Dr. Kelly, Protestant Secretary, and of others, before the House of Commons, a year later, as to what was their view, and that of the Board.

19466. In that query sheet, I ask was not the "case" thrown upon the parents of withholding their own children, and seeing that their children were kept away, if they so pleased?—There are obvious civil rights of the parents, quite compatible with the duty of the patron, which was to remove the children, unless the parents had approved of their presence.

19467. Is your own interpretation of that language—that the case was not thrown upon the parents in regard to the withholding of their children?—My view is that the case was not thrown; that the parents had that right, but besides the parent having that obvious natural right, the patron had an official duty and obligation and that under his hand be signed and connected that obligation knowingly and willingly, and that years after, the Commissioners (in 1839) italicize, in one of the most remarkable of their reports, that it

was of the essence of the rules that the patron, should exclude such children.

19468. To what class of schools had that query sheet reference—vested or non-vested?—Vested.

19469. Are you sure? (Rowe).—"Query sheet to be signed by Applicants for aid towards the building of schools?"—Yes, it is the class of vested.

19470. That on page 142?—Yes, that query sheet refers to a vested school.

19471. Are you sure that referred to the case of a vested school or a non-vested?—To a school vested, because they could not get one to fit up unless they vested it.

19472. Look to page 112 and read query 9?—It is to a vested school—"For aid towards the building of school-houses," pages 113-116, Appendix G Report 1836.

19473. (Rowe).—"Will you take care that no children be present at any religious instruction or exercise except those whose parents consent to their being so?"—My lord, that query finally settles the question, up to 1869, that patrons were bound to exclude minorities.

19474. Do you still maintain that those two query sheets refer to the same class of schools?—No; they refer to different classes, vested and non-vested.

19475. Does not the one refer to non-vested and the other to vested schools?—There was never any such distinction made, from the time the Board was founded until this hour—and the system has been in existence for 37 years—between vested and non-vested schools as to exclusion or non-exclusion.

19476. Give a categorical answer to the question?—I have done so.

19477. Does the first refer to the class of non-vested schools?—No.

19478. And does the second not refer to vested schools? In the second case on whom is the onus thrown?—Both the one and the other refer to vested schools.

19479. So that in your opinion there is no distinction made between vested and non-vested schools?—There is no distinction whatever on that ground, nor was there ever one, from the time the Board was founded until the hour at which I now speak. It is the simplest thing in the world to supply evidence against me, on the point, if such can be done.

19480. Can you supply or produce a case in which the patron of a non-vested school ever was required to exclude or put out children of a different faith?—Thousands, but will you allow me to state the several groups or stages of cases chronologically, and I pledge myself to state none but a very important group or class, or do you ask me to name some particular one?—For they are so numerous I wish to comply with your wish, but I am at a loss to know how to answer you in detail. I will begin at 1833, and go on to Archbishop Stoford in 1847, and prove the accuracy of my statement, at every intermediate date. Name any period within the whole of that space, now, if you like—a fair invitation—and I undertake to prove the patron's obligation to exclude.

19481. I ask you now was not aid from the first freely given in the case of non-vested schools to applicants who expressly said in their applications, that they would do no more than give liberty to the children to withdraw if they pleased?—In the year 1826 one of the query sheets stood thus, and continued so till 1839, concluding with the following pledge at the foot of it:—"We, the undersigned, request the above aid from the Commissioners of National Education, believing the queries to be fully and truly answered, and engaging that the school shall be conducted according to the regulations set forth in our answers," one of these being the question already quoted.

19482. Is it not the fact, that applicants again and again have stated, that they would do no more than give liberty to the children to withdraw if they pleased, and that whenever that statement was made, and not until then, aid was granted?—To entitle the applicant to aid, he had to affirmatively answer

Nov 22, 1878

James Wm  
Kavanaugh,  
Esq.

No. 25 5825.  
James Wm.  
Kearney  
1899

the following question—"Will you take care that no children be present at any religious instruction or exercise, except those whose parents consent to their being present?" The parent should consent, beforehand, to their being present, and if the parent did not so consent, the patron was bound "to take care" that they should not be present—that is, he was to corporally exclude them.

19483. Is that not in the case of vested schools?—Equally in both.

19484. Answer the question?—It is.

19485. Now I ask you again to read the latter part of query No. 7, page 113?—(Reads):—

"State, also, whether public education is given of the arrangement, and whether or not parents are left at liberty to withhold their children from religious instruction which they do not approve of."

19486. In that case were not the parties bound simply to say that parents were left at liberty to withhold their children?—One is fuller than the other. The two are not the same, yet not conflicting. One is a genus of which the other is a species. If the patron excluded the children, then to compel them to receive religious instruction was rendered unnecessary.

19487. Do you refuse to answer the question?—No; I beg your pardon, I have answered it. One is a genus of which the other is a species. If the patron excluded the children, there was no need for the parent interfering.

19488. Mr. Glavin.—Did the General Assembly or the Synod of Ulster enter into any relationship with the Board of Commissioners as a body before 1840?—In no sense they did.

19489. Answer my question?—I am answering it, for I say they did, in one sense.

19490. Collectively?—As a body.

19491. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you not already declared here before this Commission that it was not until 1849 that they had any connection?—My lord, this comes from the loose terms in which questions are put. Both statements are perfectly right.

19492. I ask you, have you not already stated that it was not until 1849 that the Presbyterians became connected with the Board?—I state the same now; but that is different from their entering into relations or negotiations with the Board.

19493. Mr. Stokes.—What is the date of the Corbett case?—24th January, 1849.

19494. Mr. Glavin.—What is the date of the Temple Meeting-house case?—The letter of the Board on the Temple Meeting-house case is dated 25th July, 1843.

19495. Did the General Assembly join before 1840?—No, not join; but they entered into negotiations with the Government and the Board, and had relations with them, in August, 1823.

19496. I did not ask you about negotiations?—I beg your pardon, you asked me, just now, about entering into relations with the Board.

19497. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware that any of the Commissioners of Education entertain a view contrary to you upon this point?—Upon what point?

19498. Are you aware that Dr. Henry, I suppose the senior Commissioner of National Education was examined before the Committee of the Lords in 1854?—I am.

19499. Have you read his evidence upon the subject?—Fully.

19500. Are you aware that he stated in answer to a question from the Earl of Harrowby—"Is that point now clearly ascertained, and in what way, that is no circumstances in it the duty of the patron to see that the children whose parents object, quit the school when a religious instruction is going on not in accordance with their own permission?" (Answer).—I have already stated that the Archbishop of Dublin and Mr. Blake always asserted that the Board never intended to compel any person to put children away during the religious instruction. This was the more readily agreed to, and embodied in our rules in 1843, from

such an opinion having existed upon the Board." Then another question is put, 1084—"In what way is it laid down that it is not the duty of the patron to see to the retirement of the children when the religious instruction is being given?" (Answer).—Rule 3 applies to both cases. The patrons of the several schools have the right to appoint such religious instruction as they may think proper to be given therein, provided that each school be open to children of all communities, that due regard be had to parental right and authority, and that accordingly no child shall be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object."

19501. "Has that ever received an authoritative interpretation?—I think, from the rule I have read, non-compulsion is clearly implied. I have often heard the late Dr. Murray say that he could not be a party, and I could not be a party, to requiring the retirement of any child during religious instruction.—It is the parent's right to withdraw his child, and the onus is thrown upon him of doing so according to the late arrangement and settlement of the rule. The patron is not to compel the children to retire." Are you aware that that is the evidence of Dr. Henry, one of the Commissioners?—Yes, I have read so, but I am equally aware—

19502. Is that the evidence?—I am equally aware that it is substantially, in fact, utterly inaccurate.

19503. Was that evidence ever repudiated by any of the Roman Catholic Commissioners, as given by Dr. Healy before the Committee of the Lords?—I am not aware that it was, or that it would be a function of theirs, if one of their members goes before a Commission, and gives evidence, that it would be a duty of them to repudiate it. But I will answer your question, simply. Mr. Blake and Dr. Murray were both parties to this rule that as shocked Dr. Henry, and what is more, Dr. Henry himself, was a party to it.

19504. Mr. Stokes.—Are you familiar with the distinction drawn by Presbyterians between active toleration and passive toleration?—No; to my mind it appears a distinction without a material difference.

19505. Did you never hear that while they would undertake to be passively tolerant in allowing children to withdraw from religious instruction, they refused to be actively tolerant in sending them away?—Oh, yes, I am aware of that distinction, now that you call my attention to it, but the others from the beginning objected to that.

19506. Do you remember that Dr. Henry, in giving his evidence before the Committee of Lords in 1854, stated as follows:—"I should myself prefer to our present loose and undefined system, a plan allowing religious instruction to be conveyed in accordance with the desire of the patron," and then "undoubtedly our present system is loose and leads to abuse?"—I quite agree with Dr. Henry, in the latter statement.

19507. In what light do you view the relation between the Board of National Education and the Government of the day?—First, that they are an educational body, promoting education on certain specific conditions imposed on them, and that in the matter of religious instruction their function is eminently protective, in relation to the conscience of the pupils.

19508. Is not the National Board subordinate to the Government of the day?—Yes, to the Lord Lieutenant, as representing the Government. He is the head of the Board.

19509. Is it not true that the representatives of the Presbyterian body arranged with the Lord Lieutenant of the day to impose upon the National Board what was, in fact, a serious change in their system?—They did with Lord Elington in January, 1840.

19510. Is not true that after a time the Roman Catholics, who form the vast majority of this nation, found themselves suffering severely from that and other changes in the rules, and raised an outcry, and that then again pressure was brought to bear on the Government of the day, who induced the Board to revert to the older arrangement in favour of the Roman Catholics?—Yes; the same outcry as had been made before 1840 by the



Nov. 24, 1868.

James Wm. Keogh,  
sq.

Presbyterianism, when they were depriving Catholic adherents of the right to religious instruction in their schools, thus creating first that distinction between vested and non-vested schools. But the rule of 1847, which permitted proselytizing, was not adopted for Presbyterians, or at their instance, though they have largely availed themselves of it, but for Protestants.—I mean for Anglican Protestants, who, in the person of Archbishop Stopford, opposed the National Board upon this point. The priests, clergy, gentry, and laity of the Established Church of Ireland presented an address to Sir Robert Peel in 1845, complaining of the very rule the existence of which Dr. Wilson has taken so much needless trouble to try to prove from the official documents cited. They said, in substance, "The law permits the tyranny that the priests of Rome exercise over their flocks, in denying to them the right to read the Word of God. We are obliged to recognize the law, but to make on the spiritual health of the people of Rome in enforcing their unjust control over Catholic parents in excluding their children from the Holy Scriptures is a thing to which we will never submit," and this is the essence of the objection to the other rule—that in operation up to 1847.

19519. Mr. Waldron.—What was the second occasion?—1847.

19511. When the Government interposed?—No; in 1847 the changed interpretation took place for Archbishop Stopford, and in May, 1846, the Government, acting from the O'Reilly returns, the proofs of the above, advised the change, to which I am glad, Mr. Waldron, you were a party, in the year 1846 the Board made a step towards going back to the original principle, in operation from 1831 to 1846.

19512. You stated that that was done under pressure from the Government?—The chief change to which Mr. Stokes refers, that of 1860, was made, as I believe, under pressure of the Government.

19513. I am talking of the second?—The change of 1846 was under pressure from the Government.

19514. What reason have you to suppose that the Government interposed at all on the second occasion?—By what occurred in the House of Commons on the debate on O'Reilly's motion (15th May, 1846), when some of what we call the Liberal members, brought forward the abuses revealed in the O'Reilly returns, when Mr. Forster denounced those abuses, asking was this the system from which was to be banished even the reception of proselytizing, when proselytism on a large scale was proved to be in operation? The Government said that this rule could not be defended, and they negotiated with the Commissioners, asking the change to be made, which, I am bound to say, was made by all the Commissioners, save the Presbyterian minority to which I have already adverted.

19515. Then have you no reason to believe that any steps were taken before that by the Commissioners themselves?—So far as I know, I am not aware of any.

19516. You speak positively to the fact?—So far as I know, Mr. Waldron, I am not aware of any steps.

19517. Mr. Stokes.—Would you not think it better that the arrangements under which the National Board administer rates granted for primary education in Ireland, should be defined in an Act of Parliament which to religious body, the Presbyterians or the Catholic bishops, or the Lord Lieutenant himself should have the power to depart from in any way?—I am far from general definition as to principles, but not as to administrative details. I would not be a party, myself, to administering popular education by a body of such a constitution as the Board, without something very like a code, which is not an Act of Parliament, but must be submitted to Parliament before any change can be made in it. For an over-chieftain, over-arching Corporation like the National Board, I would prefer the sanction of an Act of Parliament.

19518. You are aware to doubt that it has been proposed to appoint a Secretary of State to look after the question of education, say Great Britain?—Yes; I should like it, provided it did not lapse into a despotism

and the unity, I may say to speak, the forced unity, of some of the continental systems, and that his business should be mainly to answer questions in Parliament, to lay down the broad general features upon which aid is given by the State, without interfering with the religious economy of any one denomination and to promote education, so as to obtain its highest results, in fact, with the least amount of interference possible, on the part of the Government.

19519. Are not the religious rights of persons in poor-houses, old and young, defined by Act of Parliament?—Almost as well as that can be done, in Ireland.

19520. Do you not think that that is a system which might be adopted with regard to primary schools?—Might be largely borrowed from, and I have already quoted from that Act, in support of your opinion.

19521. What is the point you wish to prove to this Commission at present?—I am here to prove that, from the foundation of the system, from Lord Stirling's letter, October 1831, up to November 1847, there never was a second opinion held by the Board of Education, as such, held by their officers, as such—that the accumulated testimony of the whole institution, by rules, reports, letters, official action, and evidence before both Houses of Parliament, unless an isolated passage is taken—all prove that parents were compelled to exclude a child from any religious instruction not approved of by its parents. This is my precise position—this my challenge.

19522. Can you lay before the Commissioners proofs of the point which you make?—In 1833 the Rev. Mr. Love applied for aid for a school called the Temple Meeting-house School, in the county Antrim. As you may see in the first volume of the series of Reports of the Commissioners of National Education, page 9. It was, in fact, before the first report was written, which is strange. The Commissioners issued a Document Explanatory of some of the Conditions which had been misunderstood, which document had been drawn up by them, and approved of by Her Majesty's Government. The Synod of Ulster submitted Poor Propositions to the Government and the Commissioners in 1833. Upon those propositions the Commissioners make the following Minute, dated 20th August, 1835:—

"The Commissioners having considered the Propositions of the Synod of Ulster thus submitted to them, are of opinion that those Propositions do not contain anything inconsistent with the principles of the System of Education committed to their charge, and, in consequence the Lord Lieutenant having agreed to them, they will receive applications from the parents of schools in conformity thereto, and grant aid upon leaving such grants as they shall deem necessary to put a satisfactory answer."

(Signed) "THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary."

And as a footnote, explanatory of this, they give the case of the Temple Meeting-house School, stating, then, in August 1835, that—

"The following letter, dated 2d July 1835, addressed to a Member of the Council of Ulster, Rev. Mr. Love, will further explain the previous sense of the Commissioners on the substance of those Propositions. 'The rule that the hour, from two till three o'clock daily, except Sundays, shall be employed in reading, and instruction, in the Holy Scriptures, is quite compatible with the principles of the Commissioners, provided that such schools only as are directed by their parents to attend, be thus allowed to continue in the school, and that all others be then retired. And with respect to the exemption Sunday, it is also compatible with their Rules provided that those schools only shall attend upon their day when parents do not that they shall give in reading, or any other instruction in the Holy Scriptures, so that an opportunity be thus afforded for all children to receive such religious instruction, at that time, as their parents or guardians shall provide for them. As you mention that you occasionally visit the school, to watch the progress, and whenever such instruction as the circumstances and capacity of the children may require, they return, the Commissioners desire not to observe, that it is of the essence of their rule that religious instruction should be given only at the time previously appointed for that purpose, and that children whose parents do not direct them to be present at it should not be present there. The Commissioners having transgressed their view, and misapprehending that you will concur in them, direct me to signify their intention to make no grant towards the support of the Temple Meeting-house school, on your returning the paper which I herewith transmit, properly filed and signed.'

"I have the honour to be, Sir,  
"Your most obedient servant,  
(Signed) "THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary."

Nov. 26, 1868.  
—  
James Wm.  
Kearney,  
Esq.

This important letter of 1833 is reproduced, as Master Brooks very properly noticed, in the Report for 1839, at the very time the Presbyterians joined the Board, in January, 1839, how there should be any misgivings on the point; and not only is it reproduced, but all the force that Union can give it, is put into the Sixth Report.

18523. Mr. Gibson.—Is it not the fact that the Synod of Ulster did not adopt the views of the Commissioners of 1833, and refused to put their schools under them till 1840?—Certainly, but not on the grounds supposed as to its having any connection with this rule to exclude.

18524. Mr. Stokes.—Have you any further proofs to adduce?—The Board, commenting on this in the text of their report in 1833, say, in the paragraph following—

“Provided that no children shall be required to attend, or be present at, religious instruction, whose parents or guardians object to their doing so.”

In 1837, Mr. A. R. Blake, the Commissioner who wrote the Temple Meeting-house School letter, and who states in his evidence that he did so, says—

“Our rule.”

I read from the Report of the Parliamentary Inquiry of 1837, National Education.—Evidence of the Right Honourable Anthony Richard Blake—

“It is as clear, nobody of ordinary intellect can misinterpret it. Our rule is, that they shall go away, that those children only, are allowed to be present, whose parents shall direct them to be so. Our object, in short, both with respect to Protestants and Catholics, is to prevent taking the children of one communion into another, when religious instruction is being given to the others.” And Mr. M. Carile, the paid Commissioner, himself a Presbyterian minister, says, in giving evidence with Mr. Blake—“When religious instruction was going on, of the one party, there was to be no other present.”

That this very explanation, that took place in 1847, arose from an application for aid made by Archdeacon Stopford, stating he would not exclude the children, that the grammatical construction of the words of the rule admitted either the obligation to send them out or permission to allow them to remain, and until the Commissioners, at his instance, interpreted the rule to mean that the patron might permit the children to remain, he did not join the Board. Now, as his application was made in 1844, and an angry controversy on the subject protracted to 1845, and an application renewed in 1847, when the word “to” was introduced to change the meaning, it is as clear as light that the Board could not have allowed such a man to remain under a misapprehension, as to the meaning of the rule, through that protracted and painful controversy. In September, 1847, he formally joined the Board.

18525. Does your experience enable you to say that during those years it was the practice to dismiss the children?—Certainly. One of the Head Inspectors offered to produce to me the very letters written to him, directing him to see that the children were put out of the schools.

18526. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware it was the experience of other officers that such was not the case? I am not.

18527. Mr. Stokes.—With regard to the Protestant minorities of the South, how were they dealt with?—Invariably put out, particularly in convent schools.

18528. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is that done now?—Under the new rule I cannot say; but they were not obliged to be put out between 1847 and 1846.

18529. Mr. Stokes.—Have you any other documentary evidence to give?—Plenty. With regard to that point, I beg to refer to once to the whole examination in 1854. The late Mr. McGreevy, as well as myself, gave evidence that patrons were bound to put the children out. So did Mr. Cronin.

18530. Mr. Sullivan.—Will you read the passage I have marked in the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the New Plan of National Education in Ireland, Part I., page 68?—Yes, the Inquiry was in 1837. This report was printed in 1838. Mr. Blake was examined in March 1837. Question put to him—

“So that when the Board told the Synod of Ulster they saw nothing inconsistent with the principles of the Synod of Ulster, as regards to their change in the proposition which that Board had made, they intimated also the power of sending Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England that in the same schools in which that rule was to be given to the Holy Scriptures of the stated school hours, there should also be given to the instruction in the different religions? Mr. Blake answered—“I do not mean it and I think the Board meant it, and was bound so to mean it, according to Lord Sturges’s letter.”

18531. Does not that fully bear out the interpretation you were putting on the rules with regard to vested schools, which is the starting point?—It does. This equally applies, however, to both vested and non-vested schools. Under every school-reef the child was to get the following—namely, literary instruction in common with all, protection against adverse religious instruction; and facilities for getting his own religious instruction, from his pastors. The latter two of these were taken away—nothing remaining from 1847 up to 1856 but the secular instruction.

18532. Mr. Stokes.—Have you brought down your proofs to the latest year to which you proposed to extend them?—Not to the latest, but I will give you important evidence relative to a previous question of yours. Mr. Blake, upon being questioned by Mr. Gladstone, in the same inquiry of 1837, respecting the Secretary’s letter to the Rev. Mr. Love, in the Temple Meeting-house School case, July, 1835, says—

“In point of fact that letter was written by me. The meaning (concerning Mr. Love), states in its whole tenor, and it appeared to be a matter of indifference to him whether the children remained or went away during the time of religious instruction. Our rule is, that the children shall go away, unless their parents direct them to attend. The principle, therefore, did not clash with ours. And, in order to prevent the possibility of mistake, we, in our answer, stated distinctly, ‘You may give religious instruction, provided only these children are allowed to be present whose parents direct them to be.’ Our object being, for Protestants as well as Catholics, to prevent anything like taking the children of the one communion into attendance when religious instruction is being given to the other.”

Could anything be clearer, Mr. Stokes?

18533. Mr. Sullivan.—On what ground did Archdeacon Stopford ask to have the trust deed changed?—Because of two things. In the last revised copy of the Rules, 1843, the changes made by this revision were not introduced into the covenants, as set forth on the face of the trust deed. He asked—“Whether I am to be bound by the summary of the rules in the trust deed I am called on to sign or by the revised rules in force?” He also objected to one of the rules, because it was open to either of two interpretations; to one of which he would subscribe, and to the other of which he refused to subscribe.

18534. If the trust deed to which he objected was founded upon previously existing rules, which had been in operation, and that a new set of rules were introduced, there must have been a discrepancy between them. Now, upon what did that discrepancy mainly turn as regards the objection of Archdeacon Stopford?—The objection turned upon two or three points, none of them very material as bearing on our present subject. It was more the principle involved. He wanted to know whether he would be bound by the document which he signed, in which certain covenants were set forth, or by an ever-changing source of rules, outside the document. He said he would give up that one point, however, and rely upon the beacon of the Board, but that as to the other, he would not join till the rule was interpreted. He would subscribe to one interpretation; to the other he would not. Many other Protestant managers also refused to submit to it, on this ground.

18535. Is that the rule in which the grammatical change was made to which you referred a while ago?—The rule was “that no child be compelled to receive or be present at.” He said he would not compel them “to receive” or “be present at” such religious instruction, but, while he would not compel them to receive, or be present at, he would not exclude them from being present at, and that if the word *except* did now apply to both, thus binding him to exclude, he would not submit to the rule. But by the introduction of

the word "to," making both clauses dependent on the word "accept," the whole rule was altered.

19536. Who got that change made?—Archdeacon Stopford. I was Inspector, and afterwards Head Inspector of the District, and intimately acquainted with the whole controversy.

19537. The change proposed was adopted by the Board?—After three years' bitter controversy, during which the Board declined to accept Archdeacon Stopford's interpretation.

19538. They declined at first. Did not the fact of their first declining show that they had a different view of the rule from what they afterwards adopted?—Yes, not only did they decline but they wrote a letter, March 1845, in those terms to Archdeacon Stopford, which letter was drafted by Mr. Blake himself. It stated in substance—

We published a pamphlet replying to the Commissioners' conduct disingenuous and base, and that they would encourage us to sign a document binding us to certain rules and regulations, and immediately afterwards alter those rules and regulations. As you have publicly attributed to the Commissioners conduct disingenuous and base, and have never requested that change, the Commissioners, as men of honour, and with proper respect for themselves, can have no intercourse with you, nor could you wish them, having that opinion. Therefore, we request you to provide some other person to communicate with us, as applicants for aid to the school.

19539. Has that letter been printed?—In the proceedings of the Select Committee of the Lords on National Education in 1854. I give you the substance of the terms of the letter.

19540. Mr. Stokes.—Supposing the interpretation of the rules which you suggest to be quite correct, and you offer any explanation of the fact that the leaders of the Presbyterian body, the Rev. Dr. Henry and the Rev. Dr. Cooke, before the Committee of the House of Lords, gave most emphatically a wholly different account of the transaction, and yet that, during so many years, the Board never took means to set the matter right before the public?—The whole Board, as such, is not responsible for the ignorance of the rules on the part of a member of their body, who had had no experience of the Commission when this occurred. The Rev. Dr. Henry joined the Board, 30th December, 1836. His statement was contradicted by the whole evidence of the time. The Commissioners, in their individual capacity, have no authority with regard to the interpretation of the rules. They could be no authority compared, as I will say, with myself, although I don't wish to be egotistical, upon the meaning of the rule.

19541. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you not said that it was not till 1840 the Synod of Ulster joined the Board?—Yes; 24th January, 1840.

19542. How long was the Rev. Dr. Henry a Commissioner previous to that?—Thirteen months, only.

19543. Mr. Stokes.—Were not the persons who were most conversant with the original rules, and who were mainly concerned in drafting them, the Right Honorable A. R. Blake and the Rev. Dr. Carlisle?—Yes, and Archdeacon Whately.

19544. Have you ever quoted the evidence of Mr. Blake and the Rev. Dr. Carlisle?—Yes, and both gentlemen were examined conjointly on this question.

19545. Is it not much more likely that the statements of the members of the Board, who had most to do with drafting the rules, should be taken as the expression of the opinion of the Board, respecting those rules, than the statements of a man who joined the Board subsequently?—Yes, whose duties kept him away in Antrim, coming up occasionally to attend the Board—who did not join till after the evidence given in 1833-37—and who could not have had the same opportunities of knowledge on the subject as the other two Commissioners who were examined.

19546. How long were you connected with the Board of Education?—I was appointed head master of the Model Schools in February, 1841. From that time I had the honour and pleasure of constant intercourse with Mr. Blake, and of correspondence with him after he went to England. I heard from him not only the origin and early history of the Board, but also of the proceedings of the Royal Commission of 1826, and of the steps taken with regard to the junction of the

Presbyterians. The Presbyterians joined in January, 1840, so that they were only one year in connexion with the Board when I was appointed head master of the Central Model School; after which I was in daily intercourse, for four years, with Mr. Blake and the other Commissioners.

19547. Is what you stated your memory of the tradition of the interpretation of that rule, current at that time amongst the officials of the Board?—It is not merely the memory, but I never heard any other interpretation put upon it by anyone—that is, by anyone to whose opinion I would attach the slightest importance.

19548. Mr. Stokes.—The opinions expressed by the Rev. Dr. Henry and the Rev. Dr. Cooke clearly showed what was the understanding of the Presbyterians. Was it not the duty of the Board, on learning these opinions, to institute some inquiry as to the treatment of the Roman Catholic minority in the schools of Ulster?—They did not investigate it till forced by Parliamentary inquiries. The inquiry of 1854 showed the necessity for affording further protection to minorities. In 1856-6 a religious regulation was introduced, and also the Notice System. When the Board entered the country, in their Report for 1859, that the system afforded sufficient protection, I replied by drafting the terms of Mayor O'Reilly's Motion, and asking him to move for it. The publication of these terms in 1865, sounded the death knell of mixed education in Ireland. The previous Inquiry of 1854, before the Lords, had revealed, however, the fact of extensive proselytizing in Ulster.

19549. Mr. Stokes.—Was not the interpretation of the rule, as you gave it, one of the chief causes why the Presbyterians held out as a body from joining the Board up to 1840?—It was one of the causes. They had, apart from that, two leading objections. One of these was to the obligation to obtain the concurrence, as it were, of the Roman Catholic clergy, in signing their applications to the Board for grants. They refused point blank, as a body, to do so, upon which objection I have already given evidence, drawn by Lord Derby, from their own answers. They also refused to allow a priest, or monk, into the school, as a visitor. They objected to a separate day, or two, each week, being set apart, in each school, for separate religious instruction, in order—as Dr. Cook expresses it, to turn out the Presbyterian, and leave only the Papist children, by which the priest would be enabled to occupy the school, and teach his children that the religion of the Presbyterians was heretical. These points were conceded in 1840 to the Presbyterians, but a log was hung about their necks, for they were obliged to exclude the Catholic minority. Mr. Blake put that as a protection—the Temple Meeting-house letter—into the report of their junction. He put that provision in italics, and specially levelled it at the Presbyterians.

19550. All the trouble taken by Mr. Blake in the matter—does it not prove the general view held of the original rule?—Clearly, that it was the only security Catholics had.

19551. Master Brooke.—I think you said that Mr. Blake drew the report of 1839?—Yes, he did.

19552. Can you account for the letter which is there reproduced about the Temple Meeting-house school, and exhibiting a very emphatic portion of the letter—can you account for his giving the substance of it in the text of the report in language so different as nearly to justify, so far as the text was concerned, the view Dr. Wilson took of it?—I think if you carefully compare the passages, to which you yourself were the first to refer a while ago, with my words that are in the text, you will find that while they are fuller in the Temple Meeting-house letter than in the text, still that there is nothing contradictory or incompatible between both. I beg distinctly to assure you, from most careful examination, that there is no official document of the Board, from 1840 up to 1847, which is in any way incompatible with what is there stated.

19553. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—How do you account for that in connexion with the fact that the Most Rev.

Nov 26, 1869.

JAMES WILSON.  
Kilnashragh,  
co. Wick.

Nov 28, 1885  
James Wm  
Kearney,  
sq

Dr. Murray, Mr. Blake, and other Commissioners of National Education, in February, 1840, declared that at a conference between the Commissioners and the gentlemen of the Synod of Ulster, in the presence of the Lord Lieutenant, it was neither proposed nor hinted at that there should be any change in the rules of the Board?—I do say, and I undertake to prove, that there was a change made.

1854. How do you account for it in connection with the statement you have made on the authority of Mr. Blake, when on the authority of Mr. Blake, himself a member of the Board in 1840, the contrary was declared, namely:—"That at a conference between the Commissioners and the gentlemen of the Synod of Ulster, in the presence of the Lord Lieutenant, it was neither proposed nor hinted at that there should be any change in the rules of the Board?"—I say that there was a change made on the occasion of the junction of the Presbyterians.

1855. Then you maintain you are a better authority on the subject than Mr. Blake?—I do not, but I maintain that there would be no sense or meaning in Presbyterians joining in 1840, after the latter warfare they waged for eight years against the system, if some change was not made. It is simply incredible.

1856. Do you mean to say that Mr. Blake or the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin promulgated a statement which was not correct?—They promulgated a statement in the Eight Report (1841), introduced verbatim in a foot note to Explanatory Document, Section VI, as to pastoral notes to all schools for religious instruction (series of Reports, vol. 1, p. 175), which was introduced as a *Rule* in 1843, creating this distinction between vested and non-vested schools, which was the only concession the Presbyterians got, in 1840, namely, to exclude the priest and all Catholic instruction from their schools.

1857. I repeat my question. Do you mean to say that Mr. Blake or the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin promulgated a statement which was not correct—namely, that at that interview it was neither proposed nor hinted at that there should be any change in the rules of the Board?—I beg to say that no official document has yet been produced as far as I know to warrant the statement of Dr. Wilson as to Mr. Blake and the Most Rev. Dr. Murray. Neither is there any fact—none, certainly, in the reports—while the junction of so important a body after so many years of warfare—that mere fact is in itself sufficient to show there must have been a change. I have shown and proved the change.

1858. Are you not aware that I quote from an acknowledged document—Minutes of the Commissioners of National Education?—I simply state that Mr. Blake or the Most Rev. Dr. Murray are not the Commissioners or the Board. What I have to deal with is their public official acts. There was an interview—not at all, between the Commissioners and the Synod of Ulster, as is alleged, but an interview between the Synod of Ulster and the Lord Lieutenant, the Commissioners having been invited to be present, as many as could attend. Those invited, Archbishop Whately, Mr. Blake, and Rev. Dr. Henry, to advise Lord Elington, as to the official acts of the question.

1859. To show you are mistaken, allow me to read the preliminary part—"Copy of memorandum sent by the Secretaries to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, explanatory of what took place at a conference"—from which he was unavoidably absent through illness—"between the Commissioners and a deputation from the Synod of Ulster, in presence of the Lord Lieutenant." The thirteen names of the Commissioners of Education are furnished as having been present when the minute was made. Does that alter your opinion?—No.

1860. Do you alter your opinion when you hear that the same gentlemen made themselves responsible for the following as part of the minute?—"It may be observed that the parties, as regards religious instruction in the school, is, in substance, *sectarian sentiment*, similar to that in many schools under the direction of Roman Catholics?"—My opinion is wholly unaltered.

According to the Board's full and correct official statement, in the text of their report to Lord Elington himself, it was an interview, not "with the Commissioners," but between a Deputation from the School Directors of the Synod of Ulster and the Lord Lieutenant. The Deputation from the Synod of Ulster applied to the Lord Lieutenant for an audience, and such members (3) of the Board as were able to attend were present "at his desire," Archbishop Whately, Mr. Blake, and Rev. Dr. Henry. After the statement by the deputation, and the Lord Lieutenant's explanation, and not till then, Mr. Blake, with the sanction of a lawyer's mind, said, "We won't answer speculative questions, being before us an applicant case, of some school for aid, according to your views, stating its 'actual circumstances and rules,' and we will deal with it." The Deputation retired, and Dr. Stewart of Broughshane put forward the *Common case*, which school I visited since your last sitting, and upon this typical case the Commissioners decided.

1861. Mr. Blake—Where was the interview held?—In Dublin Castle, while the Commissioners had their own magnificent Board room in Marlborough street, in which to receive the deputation, which fact is a sufficient answer to the point. If an interview were sought between this Royal Commission and the Commissioners of National Education, you having this room, and the National Board having their own office in Marlborough street, neither would ask leave to hold it in Dublin Castle.

1862. Mr. Sullivan—Is there anything in that minute that was sent to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray inconsistent with the statement that the rules were afterwards changed?—Of course not a particle.

1863. Has it anything whatever to say to the fact?—Nothing. As has been already explained.

1864. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Has your attention been drawn to this point—Earl Grey's reply to the propositions of the Synod of Ulster, in which he says—"I have read with great attention the four resolutions extracted from the minutes of the General Synod of Ulster assembled in June and July, 1833, and am happy to say I see nothing in them which may not be agreed to, as in perfect accordance with the general principle on which the new system of education is founded?"—That is quite true; but it is equally true that, even although there was nothing incompatible, yet they did not join till 1840. They held monster meetings against the system, attended, by some 5,000 persons, and established gun-dubs to protect their imperilled Bibles. These and more violent things were done between that time and 1840.

1865. Who are "they"?—The Presbyterians.

1866. Are you not aware that the majority of the ministers of the Synod of Ulster were favourable to the system?—A small majority, yet they did not join. Clergy and elders, there was a majority against it.

1867. Are you aware why they did not—that they were outvoted?—Yes, I have said so just now; the ministers were in a minority, sometimes the elders, but the Presbyterians, as a body, remained out in manifold opposition till 1840, without a consideration, or concession.

1868. Mr. Sullivan—Did they not hold public meetings with the Bible carried on a pole?—Yes, and they wrecked about twenty National schools.

1869. Have you any evidence on that subject?—Yes, the late Professor, Dr. Robert Sullivan, in his evidence in 1837 before the House of Commons Committee, he being then an Inspector of schools, and having been Inspector from the first—from 1833, in the North of Ireland, gives this account, which I read from question 1867, Mr. Wyse, the chairman, being the examiner—

"When did the opposition to these schools commence?" The answer is—

"It commenced, if I may so say, even before the schools were in existence. As soon as the system was announced by Lord Stanley, meetings were got up in almost every town in Ulster. The great meeting at Rathfriland, at which Lord Rolin presided, was the first. The people were led to believe that the Government were about to send round the police to take possession of their Bibles. To this meeting they carried

their Ethics and furnished them over their heads, exposing their determination to do the best of them. After this meeting, you clubs were established for the purpose of furnishing the primary aids given to protect their Ethics. Test. Was this connected with the establishment of the National schools?—There were no National schools established, at that time. The system had been just assessed, the teacher of the first National school established in that neighbourhood, was expelled, by an arrest body, from his school, and the manager — a Presbyterian minister — Mr. Porter, of Drogheda, assembled. Test. Was this in any degree attributable to any portion of the Presbyterian clergy?—No, it was attributed to the efforts of the Rohindah meeting, in the early part of that year, 1849. It is the subsequent extension of the system, in any degree, by any Presbyterian clergyman?—It was, in the lower part of the county, and about Belfast, the opposition was attributed, in a great measure, to one or two Presbyterian clergymen. Test. Who were those?—I think Dr. Cooke and the Rev. Mr. Stoney took the most active part in opposing the establishment of National schools. The Lagan village school in particular suffered very much from Dr. Cooke's opposition. I beg to refer to my first report of this. It opened, at Nairn, at the end of November last, and a highly-qualified teacher, and on terms far more than parental, a penny per week. The names of thirty-eight children had been given to be by their parents, as future scholars. If the magistrates and representatives of the Rev. Dr. Cooke, the members have been discussed at least one-half. The enclosed letter justifies the language I have employed.

Here Dr. Sullivan puts in a challenge by Dr. Cooke, which I have already put in evidence, and will, therefore, omit it here; but, with your permission, I will continue my reading of Inspector Sullivan's evidence:—

"I would add, in expression of what he (Dr. Cooke) calls a well-known address, 'Erin go Bragh,' that there is no such thing in any of the Board's publications. It is the 'Gale of Erin,' by Campbell, that he refers to; the words 'Erin go Bragh' did not even appear at the head of it, but it is to the same air."

I now read question 7714.

"You stated, in a former session, that a great deal of excitement had been produced by some Presbyterian clergymen. Have you heard anything of Mr. McClelland?—Yes, I have heard a good deal of Mr. McClelland. At the meeting of the Synod of Ulster, in 1854, there was a discussion and a division in that body, on the subject of National education, and the party opposed to it carried their resolution, by a very small majority of others; there was a small majority of the members in favour of the resolution, which would have led them to close with the Board. Shortly after this, Mr. McClelland, at an, as was generally thought, by others, got up an agitation to deter his brother members from voting in favour of the system, at the next meeting of the Synod, in Belfast. The Rev. Kennedy McKay, another minister of the Synod, supplied the pastoral placards. 7715. Were those placards very violent?"

"I will produce one which will speak for itself. I have some here, both in verse and prose, against the Board, of a very violent nature. 7716. By whom were those placards distributed?—By the person whose name is attached to them, the Rev. George McClelland, Presbyterian minister of Abingford, and the verses are by the Rev. Wm. Kennedy McKay, Presbyterian minister of Portlough. 7717. Did those placards produce any feeling in the public mind?—Yes, in consequence of these hundreds of people.—Mr. McClelland himself states upwards of 4,000—copied. At the head of these notes Mr. McClelland proceeded to all the National schools in the district, and marked the children out of them. 7718. What schools particularly, did they attack?—The schools are mentioned in the placards, to which the Committee can refer. 7719. What occurred in the Lagan village school?—The magistrates of Ballymena, Mr. Gilson, manager of the school, got there just in time, with a party of police, to prevent Mr. McClelland from getting possession; they then contested themselves by damaging the outside of the house, defacing the windows, smashed glass, which was pointed on the wall, and pouring coals and dirt on the doors and windows, to desecrate the property."

If you allow me to refer you to the placards, which are of a most inflammatory character, and also to the teachers—for they kept a *Levee* at the time—the placards and poetry will be found in Appendix No. 6, pages 603-4-5, and 6. House of Commons Report, National Education, Ireland, 1855.

19570. Mr. Stoney.—Assuming your interpretation of the rule to be beyond doubt correct, can you explain how it happened that when the leading Presbyterians declared upon oath before the Committee of the House of Lords, in 1854, that they and their co-religionists misinterpreted the rule, and habitually violated it, no action at all was taken by the National Board for eight or nine years after, to repudiate their interpretation and restrain their practice?—I am not able to explain it, I do not think the Commission, as a Commission, I will do them the justice to say, I do not think they are responsible for the

innocency of one of the Commissioners. I think they are sufficiently justified by the evidence given by Mr. McClelland the Head Inspector. His evidence was quite different, and was a great deal more authoritative than that of the Rev. Dr. Henry, a private gentleman at the head of a college in Belfast, whose official duties engaged his attention, and who merely came up to Dublin at intervals to transact business at the Board. It is only by a miracle, and I do not think a miracle would be wrought in their behalf, that any one of the unpaid Commissioners could know anything of the details of the Board.

19571. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—For what purpose did you introduce this large quotation from the report of 1857?—I read it because I was asked to do so by Dr. Sullivan, a Royal Commissioner. It came quite pertinent to a question raised by you, I think, as to Earl Grey's agreeing to the propositions of the Synod of Ulster, in 1853. Although agreeing, Presbyterians continued to oppose the system up to the year 1840, and opposed with great violence, and I read this extract from a Protestant and Ulster officer of the Board, so old, and I think you will admit, an attached officer, I read his evidence for the purpose of elucidation.

19572. You refer to all this as Presbyterian violence to establish your position?—That such Presbyterian violence was exhibited is incompatible with the fact that the Board agreed in 1855, in the main, to the propositions of the Synod of Ulster, so that there were not strong grounds of opposition, for seven years afterwards, between the Board and themselves.

19573. Was that your object in quoting the foregoing as an illustration of Presbyterian violence?—Decidedly.

19574. Was Lord Bolen who presided at the meeting a Presbyterian?—Certainly not; those were Orangemen, chiefly, but, immediately after the Belfast meeting, the Presbyterians took it up themselves.

19575. You have said that Mr. Porter was a party involved in connection with that meeting?—I did not, Inspector Sullivan said he was assaulted by an arrest body; I merely read his evidence.

19576. Was Mr. Porter a Presbyterian?—Inspector Sullivan says so.

19577. Was he a party to the violence, or the party assaulted?—He was rather a victim, it would appear.

19578. Have you not also quoted from the evidence of Dr. Sullivan, that it was not to the Presbyterian clergy the violence of this meeting was owing?—To some of them—he named them—named by others.

19579. Not to the Presbyterian clergy—not all the Presbyterian clergy?—Some, named by others.

19580. Are not the words of Dr. Sullivan, from which you have just now quoted, that the violence was not to be attributed to the Presbyterian clergy?—As a body, but he named some violent Presbyterian clergymen. He said they were urged on and incited by others.

19581. After that did you not also quote from the evidence that the violence was to be attributed, in a great measure, to one or two Presbyterian clergymen?—Certainly, to a few. I made no remark, but read it.

19582. Do you still hold that what you read proves your position—that there was great and marked Presbyterian violence?—Clearly, for, at various places, 20,000 or 30,000 assembled at the back of a Presbyterian minister, and he administered the pledge of total abstinence to them, and that some of them carried guns—that is no passing thing.

19583. Assuming there was violence on the part of one or two, is it proper, as a rule, to speak against a whole body for the acts of two or three?—No, not in thirty, but it was far more general than I state, as all the evidence in 1855, and 1857, fully proves.

19584. Is there any large body that would escape imputation if this principle were recognized?—I never stated anything from myself, in proof of the violence of Presbyterian opposition.

[Adjourned.]

Nov. 28, 1868

James Wm. Lavett,  
Esq.

FIFTY-FIRST DAY.—DUBLIN, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1868.

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of DOWD, *Chairman.*

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, K.P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CROMBIE.  
The Right Hon. Mr Justice MORRIS.  
WILLIAM BAKER, Esq., &c.

REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NARMYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.P.  
LATHRICE WALLACE, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., &c., } *Secretaries*  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

Nov 30, 1868

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Conner.

The Lord Bishop of Down and Connor when about to be sworn and examined, said:—

Previous to my examination I wish to make an observation, with your lordship's permission, because I think it may guard my evidence against being misunderstood, and perhaps to some extent facilitate it by opening up the question. I should wish to express my personal preference for the old National system of education, namely, united secular and separate religious instruction. But at the same time my object would be to extend education to as large an amount as possible to the masses of Ireland, and I should be willing to accept and to adopt another system which I think might, to some extent, be acceptable to the various churches. I do so, not as considering it the best, but as the best under the circumstances to meet the requirements of the country. With those observations I shall submit myself to your lordship's examination.

[The witness was then sworn and examined.]

19585 The Chairman.—Does your lordship consider that in the present state of the education question in Ireland it will be necessary, in order to attract all those who have hitherto been opposed to it, that the system should assume a more denominational form?—No, I strongly object to the denominational system under every form, and under every phase. I think the denominational system would be highly injurious to the future peace and prosperity of Ireland.

19586 Do you contemplate that in any changes the united secular system should be retained?—I should hope to some extent. Of course the system which I stated I should be prepared to accept and to adopt might drift to some extent into the denominational system, but not more so than the present system of united education. Perhaps it might be more convenient to your lordship and your co-Commissioners if I stated the system which I should be prepared to adopt as meeting, I think, the requirements of the country. The system which I have alluded to, which I mention not as one that I think superior to the National system, but one which I think would in a great measure meet the difficulties of the case, would be a purely secular system, the State merely taking cognizance of the system as a secular system, and supporting the schools in proportion as the secular knowledge of the children resulted.

19587 First, then, assuming certain hours to be set apart for secular instruction, as at present, would you give to the teachers increased liberty of teaching the religion of the patron or the managers after school-hours?—I would not allude to the religious instruction directly or indirectly. I would not prohibit religious instruction. I would give every facility and every opportunity for the patrons to teach religion at any hour they pleased. I would not have the State take cognizance of the religious element, because that is the element which always, at least here in Ireland, and to a great extent, checks the progress of education.

19588 Should you propose that the National Board should give up all supervision or control over the books used in religious teaching?—As I say, I would

not have the State interfere with the religious teaching. That, of course, answers your lordship's question, because, if there be no prescribed religious teaching by the State, of course there would be no books enjoined. But I stated I would give every facility for religious instruction, that is to say, I would only require the secular education to be for five hours a day, and for five days in the week; so that there would be ample opportunities for religious instruction while the State took care that the secular education was the education of which they took cognizance only.

19589 Would your scheme attract any of the supporters of the Church Education schools?—Yes. I think to a very large extent, though not entirely.

19590 How would your system accord with their theory of the power of the manager or the teacher to introduce religious teaching at any moment of the school hours that he pleased?—There certainly would be very great difficulty if persons were determined to introduce religious teaching. But there is no prohibition of religious teaching when it is left an open question, and I think that the patrons or the managers of Church Education schools would have very little difficulty in coming into the arrangement which I propose. But your lordship has called it my system. I should wish again to say that I have only mentioned it as one which I should be willing to accept and to adopt, not as the best system, but as one that would meet the requirements of the country.

19591 In such a system as you have shadowed out, in what manner would you suggest dealing with the model schools?—If the model schools could be kept up in the present system, as retaining, in its entirety and in its integrity, the National Board system, I should prefer it. But if it was found necessary to make a change, I think it would be desirable to see what would be the next best thing if we cannot get exactly what I consider the best thing. I should be very much inclined to hand them over to local committees, principally composed, if not entirely, of laymen and managers for intermediate schools or training schools. If they are not to be kept up under the Board in their present form as model schools, I should prefer to see them handed over to the different localities.

19592 Should you allow any voluntary association to manage these training schools, giving them the advantage of the existing buildings, and paying them, as in England, so much for every trained teacher they turned out?—No; not so much voluntary associations as local committees. And another thing, with regard to training, though they might train teachers, I would not allow them to class teachers, because I think it is very desirable in all education that we should have one uniform standard for the trained teachers, and therefore I would make the model school in Dublin, if I may so call it, a university, granting degrees to the trained teachers, who may be trained where they like or how they like, but I should require them to come up to the model school to be assessed; not to reside in

Nov 28, 1868.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Connor.

it, but merely to be classed; by which means you would secure a uniform standard for trained teachers.

19393. Do you think that the training establishment in Marlborough-street is efficient in training masters and mistresses?—I have always found it so. I have always found the different masters I have had from the institute highly efficient. Of course there are different grades of masters. If you can afford first class pay you can secure a first class master. If it is a rural school with not so many pupils, probably the master at the disposal of the committee would not enable them to get a first class master.

19394. Supposing any religious body or denomination, Roman Catholics or Presbyterians, or the Church Education Society, were of itself to maintain any training colleges at their own expense, should you see any objection to the State giving them assistance in the same manner as they would in England, proportioned to the number of pupils they were educating and passing?—Provided these trained teachers passed and got their degree from the central model school as qualified trained teachers. I would not care where the teachers got their knowledge, so that they had the knowledge.

19395. If any religious body in Ireland choose to have a denominational training school for their teachers, you would not see any reason to withhold such assistance?—Oh, yes; that would be purely denominational. I would give them no assistance from the State. If they pleased they might have the training school at their own cost and expense—any denomination that pleased. But I would not aid any denominational school, of any sort or kind, with the money of the State, taking cognisance only of the secular education, whether in ordinary schools or in training schools. If any particular body, the Church Education Society, or the Roman Catholics, or any other body wished to have a training school, let them have it.

19396. I understood your lordship to say just now that you would not care where they were trained, so that they passed an examination in Marlborough-street?—Yes, that examination is simply to secure uniformity in the trained teachers, and to test their attainments.

19397. Then should you see any objection to a denominational training college receiving a grant of money for each pupil teacher that passed in Marlborough-street?—I do not exactly understand the question. Do you mean that any local school should, on passing a trained teacher, derive from the State a stipendium (and or allowance for that trained teacher—is that the meaning of the question?)

19398. Yes?—I do not see exactly the necessity of that. If the present model schools were handed over to local committees for intermediate and training establishments, I do not think there would be any necessity for that. My only objection would be that it makes the training denominational and the education non-denominational, and therefore I should like, if possible, to keep both the training and the education free from any denominational bias of any sort or kind.

19399. But supposing the Church Education Society to fall in with the system suggested by you for their ordinary schools, but to desire to maintain their existing training establishment, should you see any objection to their receiving partial aid from the State, founded on results on the number of teachers they produced and passed?—I should see a very great objection to giving them any special aid from the State. There is a training school in Dublin which, if they pleased, they may take advantage of, if they do not please, they need not. If any denomination, either the Church to which I belong, or the Church to which some of the Royal Commissioners belong, wished to have a special training school for their own denomination, I think they should be at liberty to have it, but to support it themselves.

19400. But assuming that the State only provides for the secular instruction, and leaves the man-

ners to communicate religious instruction at distinct times according to their own manner, why should the more denominational training be objectionable, supposing the schoolmasters submitted to the rules of the Board as to the secular instruction?—I do not see that the State is called upon to pay for such training establishments when it provides a central one, of which anyone that pleases may take advantage. Besides, the very circumstance of the trained teacher getting a class certificate and being classed is sufficient reward for their labour and for their expense.

19401. But in England it has been found that training institutions require considerable assistance from the State to enable them to exist?—You see the system in England, my lord, is purely denominational. I wish the system here to be purely secular, and though of course it will to some extent drift into denominational, yet I see a great difference between the State supporting a system as denominational and supporting a system which may drift into denominational.

19402. But I presume you would contemplate that those masters who taught secular instruction during the stated hours should communicate some religious instruction at other hours?—I should not require it, the patron might require it, nor, as I have said, do I think the State should require it. I would leave it perfectly free. I should like the State only to pay for and support secular instruction, leaving each patron or manager to take what steps he pleased for interesting religious instruction.

19403. If the model schools were, as you suggest, given over on some terms or other to local committees, how would those local committees be appointed?—Of course these would be considerable difficulties, but as they would have to pay for the schools and support them, I presume those who would contribute would be the parties selected.

19404. They would be local voluntary associations?—Local voluntary associations; but I would not have the State support these model schools beyond a certain extent. If you give over these model schools to local committees, I would throw the burden on them—I will not say the whole burden, but the partial burden. And then I think that would remove the difficulty of selecting the committee, because those who came forward to provide for these model schools, to keep and support them, would be naturally the parties who should have the control and management; though I should prefer, my lord, to have the schools left as they are now.

19405. Lord Clarendon.—Does your lordship think you would be able to get bodies of volunteers in the several districts, who would accept and take charge of the model schools on such terms?—In some places, as in Belfast, you would, but at the same time I do not wish to alter the present model schools, as I prefer that they should remain; but in case it is desirable to change the model school system, it struck me that that would be the next best thing to do. I should not, however, wish to change them.

19406. The Governor.—But supposing a denominational training school sent up certain pupils to be examined in Marlborough-street, in secular matters, and that those pupils passed, might not they fairly ask the State to reimburse them part of the expense of the one or two years' residence of those pupils while in training?—They get their reward by obtaining an appointment immediately.

19407. But would you throw the whole expense of the training of these teachers or individuals, on voluntary effort?—If you do not please to take advantage of the system which the State provides, and choose to have one of your own, you can hardly turn round and say, "the State should pay for our system." The State provides for a non-sectarian system, and if the people do not like to have that, I can quite understand that they should not be coerced to do so; but then it is not for the State to go and provide another system, when they have provided one which is, I think, free from sectarian bias.

Nov 30, 1964

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Convent

19608. Then should you contemplate maintaining any model schools of the Board, except those in Mairborough-street?—I should like to maintain them all under the Board; but the Mairborough-street schools I consider would be indispensable.

19609. But is there not a great feeling, particularly on the part of Roman Catholics, in favour of denominational training schools?—I believe my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects wish altogether to have a denominational system—of course the grounds for it your lordship and the Commissioners have already elicited—but I am only stating what I think would be the fairest and the justest system, and the one least likely to lead to complications; that is a secular system.

19610. Assuming the State not to take charge of the religious education of its subjects in Ireland, provided the masters showed themselves capable of teaching secular matters, why should the State refuse to assist in the secular training of those teachers?—I do not think the State has so much to do with the training of the teachers as with the requirements of the pupils. I do not know whether the State would regard it as necessary to have trained masters. The State sends Inspectors to examine the schools, and pays these masters, and supports these schools, according to the amount of secular knowledge that the pupils have. I do not think that the State would require any particular trained master, but we should all prefer them, and the natural desire of the patrons would be, and they would find it their interest, to get trained masters, but as far as the State is concerned, I do not think it is bound to do more than look after sound secular instruction, and give facilities for moderating religious instruction.

19611. Does not the assistance which the State gives to training schools facilitate very much the acquirement of knowledge by the masters?—It certainly does.

19612. Then supposing the State think fit to continue that assistance, might it not leave the religious training of the teachers to be carried out in a manner pleasing to the different religious bodies?—I should like the religious bodies to carry out the religious teaching in the schools or training of the masters in the manner most agreeable to their own feelings and according to their conscience. I do not think the State should take cognizance of it at all. I think we may very fairly leave it to the zeal and faithfulness of the clergy of the various Churches to provide religious instruction, and, if they please, to give that instruction through the masters, and to see that the masters are competent to give it. I wish to guard against approving of any denominational system, but I thought that the system least likely to be objectionable and most likely to be approved of by the various Churches, would be a purely secular system. I am not aware that the Roman Catholics would object to it, and they would have full facilities for inculcating those religious truths which they hold binding on their consciences and those of their co-religionists.

19613. Do you consider the education given in the ordinary National schools to be efficient at the present moment?—I have not sufficient experience of the schools in Ireland to answer that question. Such schools as I have come under my own observation established in my own locality, I consider to be very efficient. But then it is a locality in which such schools might naturally be expected to be in a more flourishing state than elsewhere, on account of the prosperous state of the country.

19614. Supposing such an alteration of system as you have spoken of, to be carried out, should you consider that it would necessitate any changes in the composition of the Board?—Oh, yes; I think there should be a change in the composition of the Board, whether the changes I suggested are carried out or not, because I think that the Board should be purely administrative, for I think that a great deal of the difficulties and objections to the system of National Education has arisen from the interference of the constitution of the Board and the relaxation of some of

their rules. I would make the Board of Education of Ireland purely administrative, carrying out fixed principles and laws, and, therefore, I should not care whether the Resident Commissioner was a member of my Church, a member of the Roman Catholic Church, or a member of the Presbyterian Church. It would be perfectly immaterial, provided his duties were purely administrative.

19615. Then in any changes or modifications of the rules or regulations which might be necessary, from time to time, should you propose that those changes should be suggested by the Board, and submitted to the Irish Privy Council, or in what body should you vest the power of making any necessary alterations?—If there were a Minister of Education, as it is possible such an office may be created, I would vest it in him. If there were not a Minister of Education, I must leave it to the same tribunal which, I believe, exists in England—namely, the Council.

19616. So that if the National Board considered that any changes were necessary, they should report to the Lord Lieutenant their opinion, and any changes made should be made with the direct sanction of the Executive Government?—Well, I can hardly fancy that in my system there would be any necessity for making any recommendation, because it would be a purely secular system, in which you cut off the religious element, which in Ireland, I am sorry to say, has been the element of discord; there would not be any changes likely to occur. It would be a purely secular system, and I cannot foresee any changes which the Board would require. And another thing—I would not prescribe certain books. I should remove that difficulty. I would leave the pupils, under the new system, to get their knowledge from the patron or the master in whatever way they pleased—pretty much as I do with my audistates for ordination. I prescribe certain subjects, but leave them to get their knowledge from whatever books they like. I would recommend certain books, and undoubtedly the books of the National system recommend themselves to a great many patrons. But I would not enjoin certain books.

19617. Should you desire that the Board should retain the power of forbidding any book that they thought objectionable?—Well, that is not, indeed, an easy question to answer. I can hardly fancy that in a great educational system books would be selected in the present day objectionable. I do not know in what way you would consider them objectionable; I do not take cognizance of the religious element, and of course that would not be a matter of objection, and, therefore, matters of fact and of history, I can hardly see, would be open to objection. The Board might be allowed this power, but I consider it should be used in very rare instances; and I consider it would be very seldom that any such instance would occur. I should like to leave education as free as possible, to leave the patrons and managers free to give secular education, in fact, to do what I am afraid there is a great want for in Ireland—to educate the masses of the people.

19618. Do you think that it would be desirable that a part of the payment derived by the school should be what is called in England payment by results?—That is for paying the master?

19619. Yes!—Yes, of course I do. I do not know exactly the English system, but I think it very desirable that the master's salary should be to some extent contingent on the progress of the pupils, but, of course, there should be allowances made. There may be manufacturing districts where children may not be able to attend so regularly as in other districts, and, therefore, there should be considerable allowances. I would not have the rein too tightly drawn, but I would make that the principle.

19620. Seeing that in many cases the local funds contributed by individuals for the maintenance of schools are extremely small, do you think it desirable that a local rate should be instituted to meet a portion of any increased expense of the schools?—No; I think that that should not be, because I think the very



Nov. 30, 1865.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Connor

districts in which that would be required would be the very districts in which it would become a hardship—the poor districts; and yet these are the very districts which require free education, and a local rate would then very much check education.

19621. I think your lordship spoke of a uniform qualification for schoolmasters—I should like to have it.

19622. But are not higher requirements necessary for schoolmasters in large towns than in the small country towns?—Oh, certainly. That would be regulated by a higher class of masters. I mean, my lord, that there should be a number two class, a number three class, and a number one class. Of course, the masters would be selected according to class—for instance, a first-class master in a little rural district would not probably be so desirable as a master of less qualification, and with equal facilities for inspecting instruction.

19623. In speaking of a uniform qualification, your lordship did not mean that there should be only one standard for schoolmasters?—Oh, certainly not—not one standard.

19624. Mr. Gibson.—By secular education would you imply that all moral instruction should be excluded?—I did not say a word of excluding any. I said I would neither prohibit nor enjoin it.

19625. But I wish to know what you exactly mean by secular education?—Of course, there could be no secular education in which the moral teaching would not overlie the surface of it; but I would not require the State to take any cognizance of anything more than the progress of the pupils in secular knowledge.

19626. Your lordship is acquainted with the present books of the National Board, our reading books. Do they fulfil or come up to your lordship's idea of purely secular instruction?—Yes, there may be, and no doubt are, some lessons in these books on religious teaching, but, of course, they would not be objectionable on that account.

19627. Would you have these excluded?—I stated previously that I would not enjoin any books; that the persons might select any books they pleased, provided the pupils had the knowledge. I would not care how they got the knowledge. Of course I should wish them to have certain books. As I stated (to give an illustration) in my examination of candidates for orders, I require certain subjects, but they may get their knowledge from whatever books they please. I do not enjoin the books.

19628. Is your lordship speaking now of the training of the teachers, or the general management of the schools?—I am speaking of the schools, not of the teachers at all.

19629. But your lordship is anxious to maintain the united principle in education?—As I stated before you came into the room, my own preference is in favour of the united system of education as originally constituted; but as I feel to a great extent that we can hardly now hope that it will reach the requirements of the country in educating the masses of the people, I should be prepared to accept and adopt another system. I mentioned that before you came into the room.

19630. Supposing that the united principle be still adhered to, do you not think that books in which the sectarian elements might be introduced would not be destructive of that principle, inasmuch as they would exclude children whose parents held different opinions, and who refused to allow their children to be instructed in them, all restrictions as to the books to be employed in our National schools being removed?—I would not require them to be used.

19631. Suppose, for instance, that the books published by a Roman Catholic society, by the Christian Brothers, or by the Church Education Society, were taken into any school, would the parents of children objecting to the views put forward in these books send their children to those schools?—No, but I do not think they would have any right, during the five hours of the day to which I would limit the secular instruction, to introduce any books of a sectarian character.

19632. If your lordship withdraws all restriction from the books, would you put denominational books into a school which, according to your lordship's views, is strictly non-denominational?—But I would not introduce denominational books.

19633. That is a restriction?—The restriction is to secular; I should say, perhaps, that there should be books for the use of secular instruction.

19634. I understood your lordship to say that you would not allow even a vote to the Commissioners on the books used in National schools, that you would give unfettered liberty to introduce books that would provide the greatest amount of secular knowledge; I would ask how your lordship would reconcile the introduction of denominational books with a non-denominational system?—I should have expressed myself more guardedly by saying I would take no cognizance of books, provided they were books containing only secular instruction for pupils during the secular hours, and I stated I would require each school to give secular instruction five hours a day, and five days in the week, leaving any other hour and day for such religious instruction as the different pastors or managers might feel bound to give.

19635. Now, my lord, with respect to teachers coming up to be examined in the Central Training Establishment from denominational training schools, do you think that these teachers would be likely to conduct satisfactorily the non-denominational system in ordinary schools?—Of course I am not accountable for what the various teachers might do; I am only stating what I consider that the State should do. If anyone chooses to violate the rules or break through the compact I can hardly consider myself liable to any consequences which might arise.

19636. I presume that the system in the denominational colleges would be to have the religious education mixed up with the secular?—I suppose that is your meaning of denominational?—I am strongly against a denominational system.

19637. I know your lordship is, but your lordship has been rather, I think, favourable to a system of denominational training colleges?—No, I particularly told Lord Powis that I would not take cognizance of any training colleges for different denominations, but that the teachers might come from where they pleased; I could not prevent the different Churches from training their pupils where they pleased.

19638. Well, then, my lord, supposing a teacher to come up from one of these colleges to be submitted to an examination and to receive his certificate from the Board, do you think he is likely to give satisfaction in the non-denominational school which your lordship thinks the best, being trained under a purely denominational system?—But if he is only to give secular instruction, I can hardly see that it makes the least difference where he has been trained.

19639. But the secular instruction he has been taught to give is a secular instruction which has immediate reference to, and is mixed up with religious dogma?—If it is mixed up with religious truth there can be no objection to it.

19640. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—From what you have stated, my lord, I presume that your view is very much that which was expressed by the Earl of Carlisle, when he said—"I continue to think it most desirable that in our great imperial community, where its citizens are to play united parts, and discharge united functions, to live, in short, a united life, the preparation for it should be had in a united education." That is your principle?—That would be my whole object and wish.

19641. So that it is only in view of what you conceive to be the difficulties of the present time that you suggested a secular system?—Certainly; my object is to give the largest amount possible of education to the uneducated masses in Ireland.

19642. I do not know whether your lordship's attention has been turned to the report of her Majesty's Commissioners, appointed to inquire into the schools in Scotland. Dr. Robert Lee, I presume you know, at

Nov. 28, 1868.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Connor

least by name and character, minister of the Established Church of Scotland?—I do not know him.

19643. When examined on this subject with regard to Scotland he was asked this question:—"What is your opinion as regards the present system of education in Scotland, the denominational system as it is called—what are its effects?" His answer is, "I have all along thought that it had almost every defect that a system could have, principally, because it was a barrier to sectarianism and to division amongst the people, as it appears to me." Should you agree with Dr Lee in that opinion?—Perhaps he would state it a little more strongly than I should myself. I object to the denominational system, because it serves to keep up an enmity barrier between the different religious creeds, and trains them up in antagonism, almost from the cradle to the grave, which I should wish to break down.

19644. In answer to another question he said:—"It is also a great waste of public money." Do you think that a denominational system in Ireland would be liable to the same objection?—I could not say that any system which gave a large amount of education would be a waste of public money. I should not like the system, but I should not like to state that it was a waste of public money.

19645. He also stated as his general impression, "that there are a great many parishes in Scotland where there are more schools than are necessary for the population, under the denominational system." Should you expect such a result from the denominational system in this country?—Certainly; where there was a mixed population of different creeds, that must necessarily be the result.

19646. You would not, I presume, in a denominational system, leave out of view the interests of the smaller sects, in the north of Ireland, especially, the Unitarians, Baptists, and Wesleyans, and so on?—Of course not. But when I stated schools confined to secular knowledge, there are cases where I consider the State should step in and solely and entirely support those schools, for instance, in the north, where there are, in many districts, only a handful of Roman Catholics, very often only three, five, or ten, these should be a school kept by the State, a non-sectarian school. In the south and west, where there would frequently be but a handful of members of the Established Church, I think the State should step in and keep up a school for secular instruction, and be themselves the patrons.

19647. Should you approve of the expense of the proper amount of salary necessary for the support of a teacher, and the building of a school, and the keeping of it in order, for maintenance of three, five, or ten, either Protestant or Roman Catholic?—I think the State should certainly provide, in certain localities, and be themselves the patrons of small schools in which the minorities would have an opportunity of receiving secular instruction. But under the system which I recommended, that is, secular instruction, that would not arise if the system were carried out, as I believe it would be, in its integrity.

19648. Under a secular system should there be any necessity for providing for such minorities?—There would not be any necessity.

19649. Then your impression is very much that of Dr. Robert Lee in Scotland, when he says in answer to the question "You are of opinion that the school system of Scotland should be entirely secular?"—"Yes, that is my opinion!"—That it is the best system which the circumstances of this country demand.

19650. Now, in answer to another question, "To whom would you trust for the religious education of the children?" His answer is, "To the pastor and the parents." Should you agree in that view?—Oh, of course; the parental authority must be superior to anything else, but I would leave the patrons and managers of the schools to make such provision for the religious instruction of the pupils attending them out of secular hours as they pleased.

19651. And leave it to the respective Churches, I

presume, in connection with this system, to supply direct religious instruction?—It belongs to them without my leaving it to them, as a matter of duty, and a matter of conscience.

19652. I think, my lord, you referred in the early part of your examination to parties who have been hitherto opposed to the system?—I do not know whether I should say that any parties were opposed, but I think it is patent in Ireland that as formerly a large number of the bishops and clergy of the Established Church objected to the National system, so now a large number of the prelates and priests of the Roman Catholic Church object to the system.

19653. I was in the report for 1856, when Dr. Murray was a member of the Board and signed the reports, in the report for 1859 and so on, this statement, "It has been earnestly embraced" (referring to the system) "from the first by the Roman Catholic clergy and laity in particular, and been held by the poor as one of the greatest boons the Government has ever bestowed on them;" and again, in 1862, "The committee are satisfied in supposing that Protestants and Roman Catholics are not mixed and extensively carried in the several National schools. The union between them would probably by this time have been general if it had not been opposed by prejudices which are now giving way, and as the clergy of all communions must at length see that a system of education tending to union is the only one which the State is likely to support, we sincerely hope that they will think rather of ceasing such a system for the poor of their flocks than of attempting to have another system substituted for it." This was signed by Dr. Murray, F. Solleir, and Mr. Blake, well known to be Roman Catholics. Did the Roman Catholic bishops and laity fall in with the system from the first and continue the friends?—They fell in with it at first but they did not continue its friends.

19654. Until a late period?—Until a late period, I think so, comparatively speaking, a late period.

19655. You have stated that in view of the system which you should be disposed to favour, provided any change took place, you would neither prohibit nor enjoin religious instruction as a principle; is that not precisely the principle of the present system?—I do not know that it is exactly, but I am not quite sure.

19656. But in this system to which you refer, should you keep the secular and religious instruction altogether distinct?—I should require five hours a day for secular instruction, and I do not care where they put in the religious instruction.

19657. With regard to the Church Education difficulty, my lord, do you not find that the clergy as well as the laity, are largely giving way, that is, that they are not determined to enforce the principle of introducing the Scriptures into the schools when they please, as formerly?—They are not enforcing the principle; but they are acquiring the right to enforce it, which is pretty much the same thing.

19658. Is it really a practical or a sentimental grievance?—A sentimental grievance no doubt.

19659. You should prefer to retain the model schools as they at present exist?—Yes.

19660. You have suggested if a change took place, however, the handing of them over to local committees?—Well I have, if a change took place that would be probably the best thing, but I am only putting it in that alternative, because I highly approve of the model schools, there the system is carried out in its integrity, and there is a guarantee for it.

19661. Keeping this system in view, should you suggest that the model schools should be conducted under fixed rules, and conducted so as not to deprive any children of the advantages of the secular instruction, but without any interference with religious instruction?—I would have no more rules for them than for the others, that is, I would have five hours a day for secular instruction, providing that they should give a large amount of secular instruction, and leaving a sufficient margin for teaching religious truths.

Nov. 25, 1866.

The Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.

19662. May I ask what parties you have in view as the parties to conduct those, how should the committee be appointed?—I have not turned that over in my mind, but I presume that a good deal would depend upon into whose hands those model schools fall.

19663. You would not resort, I presume, in large cities, to the Corporation of the city to manage them?—Oh, no. I would not have them under a corporation of any sort or kind, or any fixed board of that sort.

19664. Where local parties would not tax themselves for the support of these schools, what should you say in that case would become of them?—Keep them as model schools.

19665. Under the present system?—Under the present system—where I should like to see them all remain.

19666. I think your lordship referred to your Roman Catholic fellow-subjects as preferring the denominational system; is it the demand of the people or the clergymen do you know?—I believe it is the demand of their spiritual guides. I do not think that the people care much about it.

19667. By one of the printed papers placed before this Commission, I see that your lordship forwarded a memorial to the then Lord Lieutenant, some years ago, on behalf of certain clergy and laity of your diocese on the subject of National education in Ireland?—Yes, if I recollect right, it was to get such a relaxation of a rule as would bring in a larger number of adherents to the system than I found to exist in the diocese. It was an endeavour, in fact, to effect a compromise within the limits of principle to make the system more generally supported.

19668. The rule which they desired to have relaxed was in reference to the use of the Scriptures in National schools?—No; I think it was in reference to a reference to the Scriptures.

19669. More reference?—Yes, you have got a copy of the memorial, I see.

19670. Yes; the demand was not that they should have the privilege of reading the Scriptures, but merely of reference to the Scriptures?—If it casually occurred. It is so many years ago my memory may not be quite accurate.

19671. The words are these:—"Explanation to the effect that the rule of the Board was not originally intended, and shall not be enforced, to prevent the manager or teacher of any school from making such reference to any part of the Word of God, as concerns any demand, provided that under the appearance of explaining their just right." &c. &c.—I think that is very fully stated. That is the memorial I presented.

19672. It is. Did the Commissioners of National Education, my lord, in your opinion, see the point of the demand made in this memorial, and reply to it accordingly?—If I recollect rightly—as I stated it is some years ago—Lord Cardale wrote me a letter, and I considered it passed over the question, and I put it again before him.

19673. Your own words are these:—In reply to his Excellency, who had acknowledged the receipt of your memorial, you say:—"I must, at the same time, on the part of the memorialists, draw your attention to an error into which the Commissioners of National Education have fallen." What was that error, may I ask?—It is stated a little further on.

19674. Read the words, if you please?—(Reads).—"We do not seek any modification of their rule with regard to the reading of the Scriptures during the hours of general instruction; but simply permission to make such reference to the Word of God as occasion might demand. Your Excellency will perceive the marked distinction existing between the reading of Scriptures during ordinary school hours and the occasional reference to the same in the exercise of what we hope will be considered a just right in imparting that 'combined literary and moral' instruction which is required under the rules of the Board."

19675. You are aware, my lord, that the Commissioners of National Education require the General Lesson, or one of a similar import, to be recited in every school during the hours of regular instruction?—I do not believe they do require it.

19676. I will refer to the General Lesson, and I will quote you the rule of the Commissioners of Education out of their own report for 1866, page 63. They say that—

"The Commissioners require that the principles of the following lesson, or of a lesson of similar import, to be approved by the Commissioners, shall be strictly explicated during the hours of united instruction in all schools secured into connexion with the Board, and that a copy of the lesson itself be hung up in each school."

I shall not quote the General Lesson. The mere reference will suffice. The general bearing of the lesson is, of course, expressing the principles of love and charity on all parties?—Very necessary, I should think.

19677. Now, in it are not two texts of Scripture referred to, and the chapter and verse given?—Yes, so I see—a quotation from St. Peter.

19678. Those two texts are referred to, and given in the rules of the Commissioners of National Education. Do you conceive then, my lord, that it would be in accordance with the fact to say that the Scriptures cannot be referred to during the hours of united instruction with a copy of this General Lesson hung upon the walls of the school?—It appears to me that they only permitted reference to what they pleased to quote themselves in the lesson, but they do not permit the teachers to make references such as might suggest themselves to their own minds, because after the letter of His Excellency to me, the Board felt it their duty not to concur in the recommendation I made.

19679. The present mode of education and the mode prescribed by the Commissioners themselves is one that should afford combined literary and moral instruction; are not moral sanctions based on revelation?—Yes.

19680. And is not the moral law summarily comprehended in the Ten Commandments?—Yes.

19681. And it is summed up by the Great Law-Giver himself, when he says of the law, that it teaches "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," and so on, "and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"?—Undoubtedly.

19682. Now, if moral sanctions are based on revelation, does not this principle, unless there is some specific exclusion of it, *per se* entitle the teacher to refer to the Bible for enforcing morality?—I should have thought so, had I not got that letter from the Commissioners.

19683. And are not the Commandments suspended in every school where the managers desire?—They are not required to be suspended, I believe.

19684. Now, is it not the fact that in such National schools a copy of the Commandments is openly exposed all day in the school?—I am not sure either that it is required as a *sine qua non*.

19685. I think your lordship has already referred to the fact that the reading books contain many references to if not quotations from the Bible?—They contain many distinct and accurate quotations from the Bible, and also references to it.

19686. And I presume these may be used at any time by the teacher?—Are you talking of the present system?

19687. Of the present system?—Of course, say of the books can be.

19688. And unless when objected to—and I have specially in view the clergy and laity of your own Church in this connexion—unless when objected to, cannot the Scripture Lessons and books of Sacred Poetry be used during combined instruction? I had better read the rule of the Commissioners, Part I, section 5, paragraph 7.—"In accordance with this rule the rules as to religious instruction do not apply, except in the way hereafter stated, to the Scripture Lessons and the book of Sacred Poetry, or to the matter contained in the common school books, or in any other book the use of which the Commissioners may at any time sanction for the purpose of united instruction?"—Of course, that is, according to the rule.

19689. With regard to the memorial, did not the refusal of the Board of Commissioners of National

Nov. 30, 1860.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Connaught.

Education, in your opinion, amount simply to this:—  
“We can give no general permission to use the Bible during combined instruction, because thereby the doors would be opened to gross abuse, which it would be impossible to check?” Should you think that was the main idea that the Commissioners of National Education seemed to entertain when they replied to the memorial?—It is hard for me to say what was in the minds of the Commissioners, but it seemed to me that the Commissioners thought that it would be opening the door to a larger violation of the system than I contemplated in the memorial. I think they thought that others might take advantage of that to introduce the religious element into the secular teaching.

19492. But, keeping in view the fact that in their own reports, and in their own general lessons they refer to the Ten Commandments and to passages of Scripture, should you suppose that they prohibited all Bible references?—Oh, no, but there is a great difference between the Commissioners, in one or two instances, quoting Scripture, and permitting a promiscuous quotation of Scripture by teachers of various Churches.

19493. Then do you not think that in full accordance with the spirit of the system, references can be made to revelation, and, unless abused, would not be considered a violation of the rule, or should not be considered a violation of the rule by the Commissioners of National Education?—I am afraid from this answer that I got that no direct reference can be made. Of course, there are incidental references which you cannot prevent being made.

19494. If guilty of a breach of the first table of the law, may not the teacher, in reproving a child, refer to the first, second, third, or fourth Commandment?—I believe he has that permission.

19495. And if guilty of a breach of the second table of the law, striking or lying, or any other, may he not refer to the second part, the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth Commandments?—Well, I suppose so.

19496. I will ask your lordship one more question upon this point. Should you say that under the present combined system of education, there is ample scope for reference to Divine revelation for the purpose of training the children in the National schools in the principles of morality?—I hardly think there is ample scope when I find here that this modified request, which I made on behalf of the clergy of my diocese to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, was denied on the part of the Commissioners. If it was not denied, I should have thought there was ample scope from the circumstances which you have laid before me.

19497. Are not all the principles of morality embodied in these Ten Commandments which are hung up in the school?—I am not aware that they are always hung up in the schools, if they are they do embody them.

19498. Master Brooke—I think your lordship stated that, appearing as you do of the National system, the secular system was something that you would be willing to accede to for the sake of conciliating those who are opposed to the National Board system?—Not for the sake of conciliating, but for the sake of bringing in a larger amount of the masses of the uneducated people of Ireland; not for the sake of conciliating at all.

19499. I meant to more than you say?—I desire to make it more acceptable, to make it more general.

19500. Now, with regard to the system which you suggested, do you mean that during those five hours of secular instruction anything like distinct religious teaching should be excluded?—I should make no rule about it, but I certainly think that there should not be any distinct religious teaching during the hours of secular instruction, inasmuch as I only require five hours for secular instruction each day, which would leave an ample margin for any patron or manager to introduce religious instruction.

19501. I thought your lordship meant to leave them quite free, to say nothing about religion?

—I say nothing about religion, but I say there should be five hours of secular instruction.

19502. And afterwards I understood you to say that there should be no religious instruction?—No; I say there should be five hours for secular instruction, and if they bring in another hour, say six hours a day, and put in religious instruction, they may do so if they please. All I say is that the school should be open five hours of each day for secular instruction.

19503. During those five hours, should there be any rule forbidding, for instance, the use of reading lessons taken from the Scripture?—There would be certainly some difficulty to my mind as to prohibiting the Scriptures, but I think that five hours a day should be kept perfectly free from the religious instruction of any kind at all—perfectly free.

19504. Did you plan to contemplate that that should be secured by a distinct negative rule forbidding the exercise of any religious instruction during the five hours?—It might require that.

19505. Then, supposing such a rule, it would, of course, exclude from the Protestant schools the use of the Scriptures during the five hours, and it would exclude from the Roman Catholic schools the reading of any Roman Catholic book of devotion or ecclesiastical history, the history of their Saints, we will suppose?—I certainly see that there should be some must be of course, I am afraid, very many difficulties and complications which would arise in carrying out even secular instruction; but by introducing the religious element as little as possible into the system as a system, I think we might, to some extent, overcome them. What I meant to say was this, that I did not think it would be right to say there should be three hours of secular and two hours of religious instruction in the school, or any proportion you please. I thought that the State pays for the education of the children, and that it has a right to require that a certain portion of the time of the children should be occupied in that instruction which it is paying for.

19506. No doubt; but as the object is to make the system as generally popular as possible and to bring in those who have hitherto held out against the plan of the State?—I should like to see such a result.

19507. Might I ask you, with great respect, would not this new system be rather more offensive than the old if there is a positive prohibition of any reference to religion during the five hours?—They might put the religious instruction where and how they pleased, if the master certified that there were five hours in each day, and five days in each week devoted to secular instruction; and I think I should make no further inquiry. If the master or patron gave a certificate that there were five days in the week, and five hours in the day, devoted to secular instruction, I would not trouble myself about where they put the religious instruction, in the middle or centre, I would make no rules about it.

19508. Then your lordship would have no rule on the subject?—None whatever, provided that the master certified that the school was kept open five days in the week, and five hours of each day for secular instruction; because, as you say, it would exclude a large number of persons. But I have not given such grave consideration to the system, so that I could enter further into the details. I have been shadowing the outline, but I certainly say, that it requires to be gravely considered.

19509. Mr. Stokes—With regard to the exclusion of Scripture, my lord, are you aware that the present practice of the Board does not preclude the teachers from setting texts of Scripture as writing-examples in the ordinary lessons?—I was not aware of it, that is, texts were furnished—not texts which the teacher had selected himself; because there is a great deal of difference in that. You might teach sectarianism if you picked out certain texts, but if it was left in the hands of the Board they would only use texts of that character to which all churches would give their assent.

19510. Have you never heard that a teacher might

Nov. 26, 1868.  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Conner.

use controversial texts as the copies for writing, and yet violate no rule of the Board, and receive no reprimand from Marlborough-street?—I think he should, and that he was violating a rule of the Board, but that is a matter of fact one way or the other.

19709. Is the examination of the Board's Inspectors confined to what would be called the secular subjects taught in the National schools?—Whenever I have been present, it has always been confined to secular instruction taught in the National schools. I do not mean to say it is limited to that.

19710. Would your lordship kindly listen to a description given by Dean Hoare, in 1852, of an examination at which he was present?—“I have heard the children examined very fully in the ordinary lessons in the Fourth and Fifth Books, in the presence of these Roman Catholic clergymen, by a Roman Catholic examiner, the very intelligent Head Inspector, Mr. Kavenagh, and he examined the children so minutely in the lessons on Scripture history in the school, that some of the friends of the school who were not aware that he was a Roman Catholic, thought him a very indolent Protestant Inspector, who was going on a very dangerous ground. He said before he began, ‘I see Roman Catholics and Protestant clergymen present, and I am anxious to examine these children in the lessons of Scripture history, in order to show to all here, and to these clergymen particularly, that they do acquire a considerable amount of Scripture knowledge in these schools by these books.’ Accordingly, he examined them not only in the history about the journeys of the children of Israel in the wilderness, the call of Abraham, and so on, but he asked them the distinction between the moral law and the ceremonial law, the purpose of Christ’s coming into the world, and the prophecies relating to it. It was an interesting a Scripture examination as I ever happened to hear in any school, with the most intelligent answering I remember ever to have heard.” Supposing that amount of Scripture information to be acquired or acquirable in any National school, does your lordship think that anything more is required in the way of teaching Scripture in the ordinary school?—No, it certainly appears to me to meet the requirements which anybody would have a right to make, but I believe those very books you have quoted have been withdrawn from the schools since.

19711. Do you contemplate any change in the present management of ordinary National schools?—If the present system is to be preserved, I do not think that in rural schools I should suggest any change. I am the manager and patron of a school myself, and I do not know that I have any difficulties.

19712. In a matter of such importance as primary education, do you think it is safe to rely upon religious zeal without religious sanction, for securing managers of schools?—No; I think it is very likely that religious zeal might overstep the limits of prudence.

19713. If you rigidly exclude religion for five hours a day from the schools, do you think that the religious persons who almost exclusively are the active managers of schools, would be willing to undertake the duty of management?—No, in reference to an answer which I gave Master Brooke, I think I stated that after consideration, I should not be inclined to exclude it, but I should only require that the master should give a certificate that the school had been open for five hours a day, so many days in the week, for secular instruction. I see there would be a difficulty in excluding it. As I said, I would neither prohibit it nor enjoin it.

19714. Would you desire to see the rules under which public aid is distributed in promoting education, embodied in an Act of Parliament, so that it should be beyond the power of the Government of the day to make any change in them?—Yes; I should like the rules, so far as possible, to be fixed and stereotyped, and therefore that the Board should be only administrative.

19715. With regard to the exclusion of anything like sedition or immorality from the school books, do you think that the power which the Board would

always enjoy of refusing any further aid to the schools in which anything so improper should be introduced, would be enough to prevent any chance of the introduction of such books?—I think the common law of the land would punish the introduction of sedition into any schools.

19716. Are you not aware that it has been stated that in the hedge-schools frequently sedition and improper books were used?—No doubt of it.

19717. If the teachers’ position were made really a desirable one in point of emolument, and if training were a proof in fact of the improved qualification of the master, not only as a scholar but as a teacher, would not persons be likely to get training for themselves at their own cost, and without going to the State for it, without the necessity of founding training schools for it?—Oh, yes; in answer to the Earl of Powers I said that I was against keeping up training schools, that they might get their training where they pleased, provided they got a certificate from Marlborough-street, which I called a university for granting degrees to the other training schools.

19718. As long as the teacher’s position is not one which young men desire, is it not necessary to tempt them into the profession by offering them advantages of training which they otherwise would not have?—I think National schoolmasters are not generally sufficiently or adequately paid to secure a large number of men coming forward. But I think that anything you could do to raise the status of the masters by direct emolument, or by putting them on the Civil Service list and giving pensions after a time, which, of course, would improve the status of the masters, would render greater facilities for getting competent men to seek the office.

19719. Lord Clonbrock.—Would you be good enough to state some of the objections that you have against the denominational system?—I think it tends to draw a line of demarcation between Church and Church, more severe and more marked, and I think that the fact of children separated in early life from their fellow-children, simply because they hold different religious views, must necessarily produce in their minds an antagonistic spirit against the religion of those with whom they meet mix afterwards. I think that is the tendency. I do not mean to say it is a general thing.

19720. Then do you think that children of different denominations having been brought up at the same school are likely to be better fellow-subjects for the rest of their lives?—I do not say better fellow-subjects, but they mix with kinder feelings with those who hold different religious views.

19721. Do you think they will have less religious animosity?—I think united education must always necessarily produce less religious animosity, inasmuch as you form friendship with those who have different religious views from your own, and therefore it necessarily softens the asperity which a great many in this country, I am sorry to say, of the different Churches feel one to another.

19722. But practically, do we not find that in that part of Ireland where mixed education prevails most extensively—that is where Protestants and Catholics are brought up together in the schools—religious animosity prevails more in afterlife than probably anywhere else?—I am hardly prepared to admit that.

19723. Is it not so a good deal in the North, that there is more antagonism there, or certainly quite as much as in other places?—But there are other elements working in the North, political elements and party feelings, quite external from any school instruction.

19724. But, at all events, mixed education does not seem to have moderated that, because a generation has grown up, and children who have been educated under the mixed system have grown to be men?—I am sorry to say mixed education is not so general as it has been. I think the present system is drifting fast into the purely denominational.

19725. So it is in our western part; it is denominational.

Nov. 26, 1898.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down and  
Connor.

dential simply because there are few Protestants to be mixed. And do you not think that one advantage of the present system is that it may be denominational where a denominational system is more required, and it may be mixed where the advantage of having a mixed system are apparent in any particular portion of the country?—That is only so far denominational because there happens to be one creed predominating that attends the school, but it is not supported as a denominational school. The country does not recognise it as denominational, but supports it as a system of united education.

19729. Under the present system, I believe that the Board are in the habit very frequently of granting, at the request of another patron, a separate school, though, in fact, the one school in the neighbourhood would be sufficient, supposing united education was preferred there?—I am sorry to say the Board have done and do such things, and I think it is an encouragement on the part of the Board to a denominational system.

19730. That is apparently that the Board have found themselves constrained to make the system more denominational in order to carry it on. Now, you say you prefer a purely administrative Board, the rules having been stereotyped by Act of Parliament?—Well, as far as it possibly can be done, because I think it would lead to less future complications.

19731. Then I presume you are not aware that there have been a good many changes in the system since its foundation—a good many changes in the rules?—A good many changes in the rules; and there has been an entire change in the constitution of the Board, which I think is objectionable.

19732. But is it your opinion that those changes which have been made by the Board have tended to the better working of the system, or the worse?—I do not find that the changes have rendered the system a bit more acceptable to the members of the Roman Catholic Church. On the contrary, I think there is greater opposition, and, no doubt, conscientious opposition.

19733. But is your lordship of opinion that if the Board had made no alteration in their system, the system would have been as extensive throughout Ireland as it is at this moment?—I think so. I think that the very body of the Board to try to under the system acceptable here, there and everywhere, has induced others to make demands which, after some time, have been needed to. I think of the Board had kept rigidly to the terms of Lord Stanley's letter, and entirely confined themselves to the combined secular and separate religious instruction, there would be probably less disadvantages feeling, and more education under the Board.

19734. But do you think that the general result of the Board's according to those demands, has been to increase or diminish education?—I am not in a position to answer that question. It certainly has not modified the opposition to it. I could not say what the result has been, because I have only a local knowledge.

19735. With respect to the training schools, your lordship appears to think that denominational training schools would be objectionable, as all other denominational schools?—So far as the State is concerned.

19736. And does your lordship believe that irrespective of any governmental encouragement, persons who are anxious for education should be able to get their teachers trained without State encouragement?—I should hope so. I should think that if the status of the masters were raised and the situation made desirable, there would be a sufficient number of teachers coming forward.

19737. I think your lordship wished that all trained teachers should be tested at the establishment in Marlborough-street as to their fitness?—They should get their certificate from Marlborough-street.

19738. As to their classification?—Not to reside in Marlborough-street, but merely to come up for examination as you would come up to the University.

19739. And that whatever places they might obtain there would be sufficient encouragement for teachers to be trained elsewhere without State interference?—If the position of the master is rendered something better, of course it would give a greater facility.

19740. What I mean to say is, would you prefer that whatever encouragement the Government gave to the training of teachers should be given when they came up to be examined as teachers, but not during the process of training?—Yes; that would be after they receive their certificate. I have no objection after they have received their certificate.

19741. And with respect to the question of books in schools such as you propose, do you propose that the State should have no control over any books at all?—I did not say so. I said I would not prescribe certain books, but of course there must be some control, because, though you can hardly contemplate it, a book of improper character might be found among the elementary works. I think there must be some control; but I do not consider that the books should be those books solely which are published by the Board. Though they are the best, I would not require them to be used.

19742. Irrespective of religious books, do you not think that it would be quite necessary that the State should have control over the books of the system, historical or otherwise?—Very desirable; but if we want to get a system which leads to the least difficulty, the less control the State exercises the better. I think it is desirable, but the more stringent the rules and regulations you make about these things, the more difficulties I foresee to arise afterwards.

19743. There would be no advantage if the youth of the nation were educated to be hostile to the Government of the country?—That would not form any notion of the education of the country.

19744. But would not such a case be possible if the State abandoned any control over the books?—It would depend on the master, for the master might teach exactly what he pleased. I would not like the State to abandon it, but that would not overcome the difficulty.

Mr. Patrick  
O'Callaghan.

Mr. PATRICK O'CALLAGHAN sworn and examined.

19745. The Chairman.—Of what school are you a teacher?—Ovens National school, county of Cork.

19746. What is your classification?—First of the first class.

19747. How long have you held that classification?—As well as I remember since the year 1850.

19748. Have you been master of many National schools in different parts of the country, or have you been confined to one neighbourhood?—Only to the one.

19749. How long have you been in your present school?—Thirty years next first of April.

19750. Who is the patron of your school?—The Very Rev. Patrick Canon Murphy, parish priest.

19751. What is the number on the roll at present?—One hundred and fifty-six.

19752. What was the attendance at the last day on which you held school?—As well as I remember it was eighty-three, but I am not positive.

19753. Are your children much affected in their attendance by the different seasons of the year?—Very much, as the average attendance will show.

19754. Is your parish exclusively agricultural, or is there any town?—Entirely agricultural.

19755. Is the district from which your children come scattered or mountainous?—Rather hilly, but not mountainous.

19753. Do you represent any particular association of teachers here?—The province of Munster has sent me by a majority of votes.

19754. Did you attend any meeting of schoolmasters at which a selection of witnesses was made?—I have been attending meetings from time to time for the purpose of bringing this matter before the Royal Commissioners.

19755. Have the teachers of your province drawn up any statement which you desire to read?—The statement is my own.

19756. Embodying their views?—Embodying their principal views.

19757. Will you read it?—(The witness read the following).—

Overs National School,  
County Cork.

My Lords and Gentlemen,—I respectfully beg your permission to present a few observations regarding the evidence I have to offer here to-day. As regards many of the objects of your inquiry, I fear I am unable to afford little, if any, assistance. I suppose, as you are aware, on the part of many of my fellow-teachers, to make the principal grievance their labour under as a class, and I do so with a earnest hope that you will make use of the opportunity afforded you of recommending the adoption of such measures as will lead to their removal, and thereby confer lasting benefits, not only on us, but what is of much greater importance, on the cause of Irish Education generally. A few figures will state the case of the Irish National teachers more distinctly than any words of mine. They begin the practice of their profession with a salary from the State of £15 per annum, a number extremely small in comparison with the maximum arrived at, namely, £45 per annum, while their average income from all sources is only about £21 each per annum. It is perhaps needless to remark that with such incomes they can, as a rule, make no provision for old age, and therefore almost their only resource, when compelled by any cause to resign their situation, is the union workhouse. A few words therefore run up my principal grievances—insufficient salaries, and no retiring provision. These being removed, few complaints would be heard from the general body. The amount received locally in aid of the State grant is about 1s. 1d. per annum for each pupil as the rule, or 4d. for each pupil in average attendance; and we as a body entertain a strong opinion that there is not much likelihood that this portion of our income can be materially increased.

With reference to the assimilation of the Irish to the English system, by the adoption of which is called "payment by results," the teachers almost unanimously regard it as a measure likely to render their position more miserable than it is at present. The average attendance in each school is only 40; at least one-half the children attend with great irregularity. It is easily judged therefore what effect the introduction of such a system would have upon our incomes. Our present salaries from the Board, though small in amount, are certain, and paid at regular intervals. They furnish also the only portion of our income that we are accustomed to calculate upon. To render this uncertain, and payable at times far distant from each other, would be simply to render our position miserable. Few teachers could possibly support themselves and families, if any, for a year, apart from the payment by the Board; and no one acquainted with the subject would hesitate to say that managers are very unlikely to advance sufficient for such a purpose. The introduction of such a system would also be certain to lessen very much the infirm amount at present received in the shape of school fees, it would also render the teacher's income depend, in a great measure, upon the locality where his school happens to be situated—not upon his skill and efficiency, as it does at present. The teacher in a school with a small attendance has to give comparatively as much of his time and labour to the education of his pupils as the teacher in a school with a large attendance. If the smallness of attendance arise from circumstances over which he has no control, such as poverty of population, or other causes, it is directly unjust to punish him for them; if it arise from his inefficiency, he cannot possibly, under the present vicious system of inspection, escape punishment by dismissal or deprivation. The schools in England in connection with the State are generally, I believe, largely attended, and the Government grant is only a small fraction of the teacher's income. In Ireland the attendance is small, and the teacher depends for the principal portion of his salary upon the State, therefore there can be no comparison between the two countries, and the system which might be beneficial, or at least harmless, in the one, would be certain to operate injuriously in the other.

The teachers of my province respectfully submit, through me, that if it be deemed expedient to require positively what effect such a system would have upon the education of the country, the experiment ought not to be made at their expense and risk. If it be believed that any defects in the present system arise from our fault, and that therefore we are already paid enough, the remedy is obvious. If we are not worthy of more than our present salaries, we are worthy of none at all. But the testimony of the Board's officers, and of other authorities, prove that such is not the case, and that we are, as a rule, faithful and zealous in the discharge of our duties. If this be so, we deserve better treatment than we receive;

and I conclude, my Lords and Gentlemen, by again earnestly entreating you so to act that, as far as it lies in your power, there will not be added to the numerous troubles and difficulties inseparable from our profession, the soul-depressing thought of our miserably insufficient present means, and an unprovided for old age.

19758. Assuming the State to think fit to make some addition to the present allowance of schoolmasters, retaining a fixed salary, would the teachers object to such addition being made to depend on results?—It is not competent to me to offer an opinion in that case, not knowing upon what system the payment by results is to be based; but the teachers would much prefer that the present system should be continued, provided that their salaries were respectably increased.

19759. But if the State increases the expense it is at, with respect to the salaries of schoolmasters, is it not naturally in the interest of the taxpayers that it should decrease, if possible, to associate that increase with the amount of work done?—I don't see clearly how it affects the taxpayer, but I believe that if the present system of salaries were respectably increased it would be calculated to lower taxation in a certain degree, by diminishing rates, which is of every day occurrence, and which brings in its tail additional expense to the taxpayer.

19760. If the salaries of the schoolmasters are materially increased, will it not be necessary to increase the amount voted for educational purposes?—I must agree in that opinion, I believe, so far as I see.

19761. And is so far would not that produce an increase of expenditure out of the taxpayer?—I must say that I don't clearly see the point of withholding an increase from us on that ground.

19762. Do you pay any rent to any person, either for your house or your school?—I pay rent for my own dwelling-house. The rent of the school is paid by the manager.

19763. Does your dwelling-house belong to the manager?—No. It is my own private property. I purchased it and I pay rent for it. I made a certain purchase, and I pay an annual rent besides.

19764. Do you hold a lease?—Yes, for a limited time—ten years hence.

19765. Do you think it would add to the comfort and convenience of the schoolmaster if, whenever a school is established, the neighbourhood were bound to provide a residence for him free?—Most materially. That is one of the points that I have certain instructions from the teachers about.

19766. Are there many instances among the teachers when you represent of their being obliged themselves to pay the rent of the school-house?—Yes, many.

19767. Is that a great grievance?—They consider it is.

19768. Is it an extensive grievance—does it apply to many of them?—To a good many. I would not say to the majority, but to a great many of them.

19769. Setting aside the question of the rent of residences, what amounts of rents are exacted for the schoolhouse in those cases?—About from £3 to £3 according to my instructions.

19770. In those cases where such rents are exacted from the schoolmasters, do the schoolhouses belong to persons of considerable property?—Some that I know belong to neighbouring farmers; and those that I have instructions upon belong in some towns perhaps, to shopkeepers.

19771. Have they been built by those farmers or shopkeepers as speculations?—As ordinary houses are built, they found it their interest to let them.

19772. Can you suggest any reason why the landowners in different neighbourhoods don't provide a schoolhouse rent free?—I cannot suggest any, because in the county that I belong to the manager generally provides for the payment of the rent out of the parish funds.

19773. Are the schools of which you speak mostly under clerical management?—Oh, yes; those that I am acquainted with myself.

19774. Has a teacher of the first or second class, if he loses one school, a difficulty in finding employ-

Nov. 30, 1866  
Mr. Patrick O'Callaghan.

No. 30, 1885.  
Mr Patrick  
O'Callaghan.

ment in another?—There have been no cases of it under my immediate observation, to my recollection; but I know that it is very rare for teachers to be disturbed, and, therefore, if a teacher is out of employment in one place, he must travel very far to find it in another.

19775. Within your own knowledge are there many teachers unemployed, of good aspect and character?—Not to my knowledge. I know that many of them left the employment of the Board from a sort of heartlessness on account of the insufficiency of the pay, and in the prospect also of the want of retiring pensions.

19776. Does the supply of schoolmasters exceed the demand at present?—No; not to my knowledge.

19777. Have you any pupil teachers or monitors in your school?—Two paid assistant teachers.

19778. What are the rates of pay of those assistant teachers?—Their payments rise generally according to the average of the school; but the usual pay is, for the first of the third division, £24 a year, and for the second of the third, I believe, £20 a year.

19779. Are those assistant-teachers persons who have been trained in the Model school of Marlborough-street?—Not those that I immediately alluded to now.

19780. Where did they get their education?—In the ordinary National schools.

19781. Were they monitors formerly?—No; not those that I have alluded to.

19782. Were either of them trained in your school?—Some that I have in my mind were. One of them is now the principal of a school; but the other two that I have under my own charge now were not trained in my own school.

19783. Is there any difficulty in your part of the country in getting youths to serve as monitors?—Yes, from the very cause that I have already stated. They don't see that there is a sufficient prospect for them; they would rather go into shops, or even into the police—some of them.

19784. I suppose the teachers when you represent do not enter into the question as to whether any increase to their salaries should come from the State, or from a local rate, but simply demand augmentation?—An augmentation is the first thing that they ask; but the State is the only quarter that they see any use in looking to, so much experience have they had of the failure of local fees.

19785. What proportion of your own school-children are paying school-fees at the present moment?—I am not quite prepared to say accurately, but, as well as I can guess, about three-fourths—that is, rather somewhat.

19786. In your neighbourhood does it occur that the managers discourage the schoolmasters from asking fees from the parents of the children?—Not as a rule. As a rule I know the contrary to be the fact.

19787. Do you find that the children who pay attend better than those who come free?—Certainly.

19788. Are there many children in your own school of over twelve years of age?—I should think about twelve or fifteen.

19789. Do you find that after twelve years of age they make much advance?—I do.

19790. Are the children of twelve years of age youths who are staying in the higher class to get a superior education, or are they children whose schooling had been neglected before?—The majority of them are children that ambition a higher education.

19791. Is that for employment under the Board, or for employment in shops?—From two or three cases. In the first place, to raise their own respectability—their own status; and, secondly, to find employment in shops; but the great majority of them do so for the purpose of becoming respectable scholars.

19792. Is there any mixture of Protestants in your school?—Not one.

19793. Then, I presume the rules with regard to religious instruction, and so on, have never caused any difficulty in your school?—Oh! not the slightest. There is no necessity that they should, when the school is exclusively Catholic.

19794. Do you think it is an advantage having one set of books read generally throughout Ireland, or should you prefer that any school might be at liberty to adopt its own books?—I think I would prefer a uniformity.

19795. Are there many children in your neighbourhood that go backwards and forwards to different schools?—Not many, for the reason that the other schools are rather too distant from them.

19796. I suppose you are aware that in England no system of pensions for schoolmasters has been adopted at present?—I understand not at present; but they have some means of making a reserve, that they can fall back on in after years, which we have not.

19797. What means do you refer to?—Good salaries, whereas our teachers of the first division of the first class are at present even in debt, and that to my own knowledge.

19798. Are you yourself receiving any additional allowance besides your first-class salary?—A gratuity of £13 a year for good service.

19799. Do you occupy any land with your house?—One small field containing something more than an acre—perhaps an acre and half a rood.

19800. Is it cultivated or in grass?—In grass at present.

19801. Do you keep a cow?—No, it is too small for a cow. I have sheep on it. I cultivate it occasionally.

19802. Do you cultivate it by spade, or by the plough?—Plough and spade.

19803. And if you plough it, are you obliged to hire labour, or do you get your ploughing done by some of the neighbouring farmers?—I receive it as payment in kind.

19804. Are you able to do the spade work of your ground yourself, or have you to hire labour?—In consequence of a physical defect in my arm, from having broken it when very young, I am obliged to hire labour.

19805. And do you still find the garden remunerative to you?—Hardly. Sometimes it tells well; at other times severely. Allow me to correct myself as to that; it is an advantage to me to have it, but I had to pay, as I have already said, a fee of £50 on getting the place from a man who was going to America, and that, of course, reduces the rent of it to me in a great measure.

19806. Then am I to understand that the principal points to which the masters when you represent desire you to call our attention are, increase of pay, the question of pensions, and increased facilities for obtaining houses?—Yes; and in addition to that, I enter our humble but respectful protest against payments by results.

19807. Some of the witnesses have spoken to us as to the relations of managers with masters; do you wish to represent anything on that head?—Any question that your lordship is pleased to put I shall be most happy to answer.

19808. Have you been asked to make any representation on the subject?—Well, the question has been mooted by the teachers. Some of them have been writing to me, stating their cases as cases of grievance; but as far as my own experience of nearly thirty years goes, I have never known a solitary instance of oppression on the part of a manager, yet the teachers do complain of it. One case of a grievance would permeate nearly the entire body.

19809. Do you think the existing school system could be carried on if the managers had not liberally to choose their masters?—I would not be at all for interfering with the managers, because I don't well see how we could do without them in carrying out the system properly. That is my individual opinion.

19810. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What is the rate of increase of salary, according to the present system that you would suggest to the Commissioners. You have said that the probationer begins at £15, and that the salaries go up to £82 for a teacher of the first division of first



class; what difference would you suggest in the way of income?—Apart from the problem, in order to make education, and the position of the National school teacher respectable, and, if I may so say, available, I would respectfully submit that a third class teacher ought to have at least as much as an ordinary stonemason or plasterer in the country. I would respectfully submit that he should commence with £40 a year from the State, exclusive of school fees, and even that would not bring him up to the level of the stonemason or plasterer, who is in receipt of twenty-four shillings a week in the country, and much more in cities and towns.

19811. Is the stonemason employed all the year round?—That depends upon circumstances.

19812. Is not the schoolmaster employed all the year round?—I have made an allowance for that. I have not come up to the wages of the mason and the plasterer.

19813. Do you admit the principle of division into several classes?—I think it would tell better if there were only three divisions.

19814. You said that the third class teacher should have £60, what would you give to the teacher of the second class?—I would rather leave that in other hands than mine. I know that if the Commissioners were to adopt the minimum I have mentioned, they would select a respectable mason, and therefore I would rather leave that matter in their hands; but if you press the question I will be most happy to answer it.

19815. I think it would be satisfactory to the Commissioners to know what view the respectable body of teachers that you represent have on the subject. Making the classes to consist of first, second, and third, you have said that the third class teacher should commence with £40 a year, what do you say should be given to the second class teacher?—Well, I suppose £60 for the second class teacher, and £80 for the first class.

19816. Would you allow the good service pension to remain as it is?—I certainly would not wish to make it less at any rate.

19817. Then your rate of increase includes the continuance of the good service salary?—I think it a great stimulus.

19818. I think you have stated that the teachers were altogether unable to approve of the increase being made up on the principle of payment by results?—I am not quite prepared on the subject of payments by results; but with regard to the body that I have been in communication with, both orally and in writing, the impression is very much on their minds that payment by results would not suit the country under present circumstances.

19819. What value would you attach to the possession of a suitable dwelling-house with an acre of land as an increase to the teacher's salary?—It would be a most desirable appendage.

19820. What general value would you attach to it over the country?—To a house and an acre of land?

19821. Yes, supposing the house to be one capable of accommodating the teacher, his wife, and four children?—I think according to the view that I entertain of a respectable house, such as I am sure you have in contemplation, I would put it down at £5 a year.

19822. In your school a mixed one of boys and girls, or does it consist of children of one sex only?—They are all males.

19823. Was it ever a mixed school?—There were two schools. They are now separated by a wall. At one time the female teacher was not considered competent, and I had charge of the male and the female schools for some time, until a competent female teacher was found. That was many years ago.

19824. When did it come to be a mixed school?—Well, at a fair guess, about twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago, but I am not accurate on that.

19825. Has there been a female school opened in the district since?—It has been re-established since as a female school in connexion with the Board.

19826. Is there also a female school in the same

house in which your school is?—Under the same roof but separated by a wall. They are distinct schools but they immediately adjoin each other.

19827. What are the advantages that you think result from having the same books all over the different schools in the country, you said you were in favour of uniformly?—Even for the purposes of the examinations by Inspectors and of classification of teachers, it appears to me to be an advantage in order that the Inspectors should have the same standard—the same programme to go upon.

19828. The Chairman.—You think it saves trouble both to the teachers and the Inspectors?—I do my best; and it is not a saving of trouble alone but it effects an advantage in the way of education.

19829. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You say that the teachers of the province of Munster by a majority sent you to represent them here; was the matter discussed as to whether you or another should come?—Yes, it was.

19830. On what principle was the decision arrived at?—As far as I can understand myself, if you will allow my modesty to speak, it was because they thought I was moderate in my views.

19831. Were there others who had higher views—more advanced views as to the grievances and demands which they thought themselves entitled to make?—I am not quite prepared to answer that question.

19832. Can you give any answer to it, can you say yes or no?—Well I think they had more advanced views in one point. I think they were more stringent with regard to the power of the managers.

19833. In what respect, may I ask?—Perhaps they are more acquainted with the grievance than I have been.

19834. To what were they disposed to object with regard to the power of the managers?—To the arbitrary power of dismissing teachers summarily without due notice, and without an investigation into the cause of their dismissal.

19835. Then was there a considerable number of teachers who felt that to be a grievance in your opinion?—Indeed there was a considerable number.

19836. How was the vote arrived at—was there any vote?—Oh yes; several associations put forward their men.

19837. It was by representation that they acted?—Yes.

19838. Can you state the number on each side that voted as to whether you or another teacher should come to this Commission to give evidence?—Pardon me, I don't well understand the first part of the question.

19839. If the matter was decided by vote can you state the numbers?—Well, I saw, I think,—that is to say, if I take each association as a vote.

19840. As represented?—As represented. Well, I think it is about four to one, or at least three to one.

19841. Appointing you?—Yes.

19842. What were the numbers on each side?—I may almost say that I was unanimously adopted. There was one man put up from Kerry.

19843. Can you give us the numbers?—I could after a short time.

19844. You represent Munster; how many associations are there in Munster?—I am not prepared to answer that. I have not statistics at my command to answer that question.

19845. Can you state the number of associations that were represented, and that voted when you were appointed?—A little time would enable me to do so. (Pause.) I have eleven just made out at once, but I think there were more.

19846. Take a little more time?—Twelve.

19847. What was the state of the voting at the decision, do you know, were you present?—No. I was present in Cork. I was chairman of the Cork Association, and I suggested another man myself.

19848. Were you present in Cork when the decision was come to appointing you to appear here?—I was.

19849. What was the state of the voting?—Unanimous, in Cork.

Nov. 30, 1885.  
—  
Mr. Purcell  
O'Callaghan.

Nov 26, 1882  
Mr Patrick  
O'Connell.

18850. Have you not just told us a little while ago that you were not unanimously appointed. I am not referring to the Cork Association, I am referring to your appointment as representative of the Munster Association. Give the state of the vote in that case?—There were twelve associations in my favour.

18851. How many were against you—how many were for the other?—As well as I know, there were only two for the other.

18852. Are you aware whether or not there are any more associations?—There are.

18853. In favour of another party?—No, but that were neutral, or had not time to come up.

18854. You think that the parties representing associations who were in a minority, are in favour of some limitation of the power of managers as to the dismissal of teachers?—I am of opinion that they are in favour of some limitation with regard to it—something, suppose, like the English system, giving at least a month's notice, or something like that, and an investigation into the cause of dismissal. That is the only thing I know connected with it.

18855. The teachers from different districts and different associations in the counties of Limerick and Clare have called on me and stated as amongst their grievances, the power of managers to dismiss teachers. Do you regard yourself as representing them?—I do, some of them. Some of the teachers have written to me on that very subject.

18856. Do you sympathize with their views?—Speaking of the managers as a body, I don't think the great majority of them require it. I know there are cases.

18857. Shall we understand that you are here to-day not commissioned to state this to us as a grievance?—I am stating just what I feel to be facts.

18858. Have you heard these teachers speak of the mode of payment of salaries through managers,—do they object to that mode of payment?—No. I think I heard a solitary person saying that they would much prefer that the payment was direct to themselves.

18859. Are there any associations in the southern province of Munster who think so?—No. I never heard it at all from an association; only from some individual.

18860. With regard to the teachers, may I ask are the teachers generally satisfied?—I mean the deserving teachers—with the principle on which the good service salary is given?—As far as I am competent to form an opinion, I think they are.

18861. Do all deserving teachers, on a matter of course, obtain that good service salary?—I think it ought to be extended to more of them, that it is rather limited, and that it would be a very great stimulant if it were made more extensive.

18862. Did all the associations, or the majority of them, in the province of Munster, until a late period, put forward from time to time, the statement that the power of the managers as to dismissal was a grievance?—In some cases, I believe it was put forward.

18863. I ask, so far as you know, representing Munster, did the majority of the associations in Munster feel it to be a grievance till a late period?—I was not in communication with the majority of them till a late period.

18864. What is your opinion?—Well, my opinion is, that the great bulk of them—I could not say the majority—were in favour of that opinion.

18865. Can you say why they needed from it?—Really I cannot.

18866. Should you think it a benefit, as representing the teachers of the province of Munster, that the power of the managers as to dismissal should be limited?—In order to meet the cases of grievances that have been put forward I think it would be well that it should be to a certain extent.

18867. Do you, individually, think that it ought to be limited?—With regard to my own individual opinion—

18868. But as representing others, you know, with the cases in view that you have before your mind?—I

cannot deny—I don't intend to do so—that several of them, particularly as individuals, have been sending up complaints; but as to the associations as bodies, having given me instructions, they have not.

18869. I have not asked you that question?—I have not understood your question, so.

18870. As representing the Munster teachers, should you give it as your opinion that the power of the managers as to dismissal ought to be limited?—I don't think that it would benefit the cause of education to have it limited, except within the degree of giving the teacher an opportunity of explaining, or at least of knowing why he was dismissed, and an investigation.

18871. Would you limit it simply to the teacher becoming acquainted with the reason of his dismissal?—No; I would limit it so far as that he ought to get a certain amount of notice, say a month, as in England, and a proof of the cause of his removal.

18872. The *Chesham*.—Why does not the schoolmaster, when he goes into the school, bargain that he shall have a month's notice of dismissal?—I never knew a precedent for that. It is not the practice at any rate. I can't account for why they don't do it, but it is not the practice.

18873. If a youth goes into a shop as a clerk, or apprentice, or assistant, does he not bargain for a month's notice?—Not in all cases to my knowledge.

18874. Does he not in many cases?—I am not aware I am not sufficiently well acquainted with that department of business to be able to answer the question.

18875. Mr. *Slater*.—If the Board find a probationer to be incompetent, does he not get notice from them before dismissal?—I am not up on that; I don't see the point at all. If a probationer fails, his salary is withdrawn from him, and it is competent with the manager, of course, to dismiss him.

18876. Is his salary withdrawn at once then and there, upon the failure, or is it continued for a certain period after the failure?—At the end of three months, as far as I am of opinion.

18877. Rev. Dr. *Wilson*.—Although you, as representing the Munster teachers, do not feel the power of the managers, as exercised at present, to be a grievance, yet would the Munster teachers be disposed to take advantage of any limitation of this power if made, and think it a boon?—I cannot say for the majority of them, but I know there are some, and many who would wish the power to be limited.

18878. Then the only grievance which you have, as representing them here to-day, is a money grievance?—Not the only one—the principal one. That is the way I have put it forward in my statement.

18879. Then you have excepted the class of grievances I have referred to?—Not entirely, I gave you my opinion honestly and fairly, as far as I comprehend it.

18880. What is the number of children on the rolls of your school?—One hundred and forty-six.

18881. What is the average attendance?—It has ranged from sixty to seventy. It got over seventy the week before I left.

18882. Would you regard that as a small or as a fair average attendance?—A fair average attendance at that season, for it was the very terminus of the harvest season.

18883. What has been the amount of your school fees for the past twelve months?—About £20.

18884. Do you regard that as a fair rate of payment for the children of the district?—It is much above the average, but it ought to be more, and a great deal more too.

18885. What class of children attend your school?—Have you the children of respectable farmers?—Yes, some, and of the labouring class.

18886. What extent of farms may these farmers cultivate?—Some average about sixty acres; some more, and some less; some so low as twenty acres.

18887. What is the amount of school fees paid by farmers who occupy farms of sixty acres?—I am not prepared to answer that question.

18888. I mean for each child?—Well, according to

his class, suppose he is learning extra branches, 5s. or 4s., or 3s., 3s. 6d., or 2s., 1s. 6d., and 1s. 1d. per quarter 1889. Is that a quarter the highest amount of school fees received from farmers holding sixty acres?—Yes, the highest amount from any farmer.

1880. Is the place at which you reside a village?—A country place, purely rural.

1881. Is there much fluctuation of the children, if any, from school to school?—No.

1882. Do you think, as representing the teachers of Munster, you could give evidence on that point, whether there is much fluctuation of the children from school to school?—I have no evidence of it from school to school; I know there is a rule between some teachers in some districts where the teachers act on the principle whether they won't receive children from another school without knowing whether they have paid their school fees.

1883. Supposing there are upon the rolls of the National schools of Ireland 900,000 children, should you be surprised if anyone told you that there was an extent of fluctuation of 225,000 children from school to school whose names may be upon the rolls of different schools?—Not only surprised but I would be amazed at it.

1884. Could you without substantial facts put before you credit such a statement?—I could not credit it without substantial facts from what I know of the schools.

1885. In reference to payment by results, you have spoken of the small portion of remuneration which comes from the State in England, do you know what the proportion is in Ireland?—I cannot say exactly.

1886. You have referred to some children remaining at school for the purpose of obtaining a good education in order to raise their local status and become respectable?—Yes.

1887. Do you think the communication between the Irish in America and their relatives at home operates in any measure towards increasing a desire amongst the peasantry of Ireland to have their children well educated?—Several instances have come under my observation from time to time of persons writing home and requesting that the children would be kept at school.

1888. Have many such letters come under your observation?—Not many.

1889. But have you heard that the Irish in America are most anxious their relations in Ireland should be well educated?—Yes.

1890. Are they anxious to have them well qualified to take good positions at home and abroad by their good education?—I think that is the object in view.

1891. Mr. Caban.—What amount of retiring allowance would you suggest, and on what conditions should it be granted? How long have you yourself been in the service of the Board?—Thirty years next April.

1892. Suppose you were retiring what allowance could you receive as a teacher in first division of first class?—After a respectable increase being made in the salary I would consider that two-thirds ought to be what I might expect.

1893. For the remainder of your life?—Yes, after a respectable augmentation of the present salaries.

1894. I think you mentioned salaries of £40, of £60, and of £80—suppose your salary was increased to £80, what retiring allowance should you have?—I think two thirds of that would be fair.

1895. After what period of service would you consider a man entitled to that?—I think the period ought to be regulated by other circumstances.

1896. What is the time you would fix for which at least a teacher should be in the service before he should be entitled to a retiring allowance?—The same as in the other departments of the Civil Service, beginning at twenty-one years.

1897. Do you think a man should be allowed to retire before sixty years of age?—I don't mean that, I mean that if a man's health was broken down it would be competent to him to retire after twenty-one

years' service. If a retiring allowance were granted to me in the morning, though in my thirtieth year of service, I would not wish to retire—nor will I retire while Almighty God spurs me to my energy to work. That is not the principle on which I wish it to be based. We wish it to be granted in case of incapacity to discharge the duties by reason of infirmity.

1898. With reference to the period of service?—I would fix the minimum time at twenty-one years, and let it fluctuate after that to twenty-five and thirty years.

1899. Do you think it lawful for a teacher to refuse to receive a child into his school because the parent had not paid the fees in another school, or had thought fit to withdraw the child from another school from any cause?—I believe the object of it was to prevent an undue fluctuation.

1900. Do you consider that the teacher has a right to refuse admission into his school to any child who is presented for admission?—With all due respect to you I don't think I am called upon to answer that question. I would not wish to give any answer to the question whether it was right to do it or not.

1901. The right is exercised whether it exists or not?—What I heard occurred in very few cases and was, as I understand, to prevent undue fluctuation.

1902. Master Brooke.—You mentioned that you received £50 a year school fees?—Including payments as kind.

1903. How much is your salary, exactly?—£85, made up of £62, £13, and £10.

1904. That taken in the first?—Yes; £62 is the standard salary, and the £13 is for good service.

1905. That total includes the whole of the emoluments derived from your school?—That embraces all the emoluments derived from my school.

1906. You said the teachers had no refuge when they failed except the workhouse?—Yes.

1907. Do you know any instance of a teacher in a workhouse?—I have been supplied with one instance of a teacher in Kildyart workhouse in the county Clare.

1908. One only?—That is the only one I know of.

1909. With regard to the teachers' salaries being transmitted through the managers, have you ever heard of managers who, from negligence, or temporary absence, or any other cause, put the teachers to inconvenience by delaying the payments?—I heard, perhaps, one solitary case of that; I heard it just mentioned, but not upon any authority.

1910. Then, according to your experience, does the system work well?—I have no fault in the world to find with it, so far as my experience goes.

1911. In your own individual case?—Not amongst all the teachers surrounding me; they find no reason for fault in the world with the payment by the managers.

1912. What is the reason some persons object to it?—I could not well understand the reasons of individuals; there are some people very fastidious.

1913. But they must have found some difficulty?—Undoubtedly; there must be some individual cases where they find difficulty, but I am speaking of the rule.

1914. What do you conceive to be the advantage of the rule, if a man has earned his money, why not send it to him at once?—I don't see any objection to it; I think he has as much right as any other man earning money to receive it himself, at the same time I have no complaint with regard to the manner in which I receive it myself, or in which the teachers surrounding me receive their money.

1915. Now, as to the power of sanctioned by managers without appeal, you told us there are some complaints?—There are.

1916. Have you known any instance of hardship?—Not in my whole experience of thirty years I never knew an instance of it.

1917. But you have heard of such cases?—Yes.

1918. Is there anything like a general opinion as to who should have the right to decide the question?—There is no opinion offered in that respect.

Nov 20, 1898.

Mr Patrick O'Callaghan

Nov 28, 1860

Mr. Patrick  
O'Callaghan

19919. The power of dismissal must be somewhere!

—Hardly

19920. Where would you put it?—I don't think it is intended to leave the power taken out of the hands of the managers; it is only a mere modification that is asked for by these errors.

19941. You never heard more than a modification of the power asked for?—Never.

19942. What is the modification?—A rule to be instituted whereby the manager should give a month's notice, or, in case the teacher should call for an investigation some investigation should be instituted into the cause of his dismissal; that is the way I understand the matter.

19943. I want to understand the ground of the complaints that exist—you say it is only a modification as to giving a month's notice?—Or something to that effect.

19944. That would leave the whole power still in the hands of the manager, only with an interval of a month, but suppose the question was of some alleged misconduct—suppose the manager was persuaded by false witnesses to believe that the teacher was *seen* drunk—that in some way or other the teacher incurred his displeasure—does the objection apply to cases of that sort, where the idea of the teacher, I apprehend, is that the manager is urged towards him, and ought not to be allowed to dismiss him, are there cases of that sort?—I don't know of any particular case.

19945. You are the only representative we have from Munster. You tell us there is a considerable body of teachers who object to leave so large a power in the hands of managers, therefore, though it is not your own feeling or the feeling of the majority, I expect you to tell me as a candid man what is the feeling of the minority—what do they object to in the power of the managers to dismiss a teacher without appeal upon the supposition he has misconducted himself where he has not?—You have appealed to my chamber, I feel my position under the obligation of an oath, and submit it is quite unnecessary to appeal to my chamber under the circumstances.

19946. What is the opinion?—All I can understand about it, and that I have instruction upon, and scarcely can I call it instruction, that I have not been furnished with anything from the associations, and from individual members—the only thing I can understand is, that they want some limitation to be put to the arbitrary power of dismissal without showing cause.

19947. Without showing cause? Suppose the cause is alleged misconduct, they wish to have some one to try the question?—Exactly.

19948. Would you have that referred to the Inspector, or to the Board, or to whom?—I think it would be in very good and differentiated hands, to bring in the hands of the Board, through the Head and District Inspectors. I am only offering my own opinion now.

19949. You would have no objection to such a rule?—I would not.

19940. You have served during thirty years?—Nearly thirty years.

19941. Your school has been inspected, and I suppose very frequently by Protestant Inspectors?—Very frequently.

19942. And you have not found any difficulty arising from that?—Not the least in the world.

19943. Have you ever heard any schoolmaster object to such inspection?—No.

19944. You have heard that some of the clergy and particularly the bishops of your Church do object to Protestant inspection of Roman Catholic schools?—Well, I believe the only ground of complaint is in the case of mixed schools. But being always in smooth water in that respect myself, I am not competent to pronounce upon the reasons that the bishops put forward in that way.

19945. You cannot imagine the objection?—Truly I cannot, for this simple reason, that during the whole of my thirty years, both my former and present managers were on just as friendly terms with Pro-

testant and Presbyterian Inspectors as with any Catholic Inspectors. Therefore, no case arose under my observation to enable me to arrive at a conclusion.

19946. How do you provide for the repairs of your school house?—The manager gets them done from a parochial fund.

19947. Are they promptly done?—There may be some delays under particular circumstances.

19948. If such a storm as that of last night strikes off half a dozen shingles and the water gets in—so that repaired as quickly as it ought to be?—Indeed, perhaps not. It is long since there was a case of the kind under my observation. With regard to my own school I know there were repairs delayed for some time because the manager wished to throw off the roof altogether, and to renew it, and he did not grudge to have at a little disfigured to shame the people into the work. I know there are some cases where the teachers are called on to repair the school-houses, and are left to repair them too.

19949. Is that considered a hardship?—Indeed it is.

19950. If the teacher got a competent sum for repairs, and that they were left in his hands, he would repair quickly, you think?—No doubt for his own sake he would. It would be his interest.

19951. What is the general age of the children leaving school?—That is rather fluctuating.

19952. I think you mentioned already that a certain number in your school are more than twelve years of age?—Yes, some fifteen, and some sixteen years of age.

19953. About how many of the 146 in the school?—I do not think I would be wrong if I said twenty, though I said a while ago twelve or fifteen. I may say that as many as twenty are above twelve years of age.

19954. Do the teachers ever give up their schools without giving notice?—I have never known an instance of it.

19955. Do they consider themselves bound in honour to give notice to their employers?—I think as a rule they do. I think I heard some time ago that a teacher—perhaps feeling that he was aggrieved by the manager, handed him the keys on the spot. That I suppose was through a little temper.

19956. The great majority of the children leave school at about twelve or before twelve years of age?—The great majority are under twelve.

19957. Speaking generally, through what books have they got by that time?—First, Second, and Third.

19958. What proportion of the children do you think leave school without having got beyond the First Book?—Really I do not know that any leave without going beyond the First Book.

19959. Most of them, I suppose, have got to the Third Book before they left?—Yes, I would say the most of those leaving have got as far as the Third.

19960. Some have got no further than Second?—Yes.

19961. They can hardly read with fluency when they leave in the Second Book?—Hardly.

19962. They could not take up a newspaper and read it?—Hardly.

19963. Do many go away not having got further than Second Book?—No, I think they would continue, at any rate till they arrive at Third Book, unless in case of removal from one parish to another.

19964. You think that every child that leaves your school is, generally speaking, able to read fluently?—Some not fluently, but the majority are.

19965. So as to take up a newspaper and read it comfortably?—No.

19966. Of those who go away from school at twelve years of age and under it, what proportion could take up a newspaper and read for the amusement of the family without stopping?—That is putting the question rather far.

19967. Very few perhaps?—Well, I should think about three-fourths of the number by a little culture of their own.

19968. In point of fact, do those who leave you at

or before twelve years ago, do they keep up a love of reading after they go home?—I have reason to fear they do not.

19969. Do you know cases of their entirely forgetting how to read?—I know cases of boys who retired at the age of twelve and forgot how to read.

19970. In these cases what advantage had they from the school?—I think it is an advantage to them in afterlife, supporting they go to their respective churches, to be able to read their prayer books at least, and to write their names—to sign documents. Most, indeed the great majority leaving school, are able to do that. I am afraid I was a little too strict in my answer when I took as a standard the reading of a newspaper. Reading a newspaper is rather a difficult thing for a boy leaving school. He may stammer and break down in it, when he would not in ordinary reading.

19971. What I want to know is about the state of literary education amongst the peasantry—is it on the increase?—Wonderfully.

19972. Do they read in their schools?—I am perfectly satisfied the great majority do.

19973. What do they read?—They read religious books.

19974. Are there any circulating libraries in your neighbourhood?—No.

19975. Are there any booksellers' shops?—Not in the country. They get them in Cork.

19976. Is Cork the nearest?—Yes.

19977. How far?—About nine miles.

19978. What side of Cork?—Due west, beyond Ballinacilly.

19979. Are there any books besides religious books that are read in the schools?—Indeed there are, I am sure there are.

19980. Give me examples—what you have seen yourself?—Pleasing little novels sometimes.

19981. Where would they get the novels?—Religious novels. Sometimes, for the encouragement of reading, the priest will put a religious novel into their hands.

19982. They got them from the priest?—In rare cases they do.

19983. Where else do they get them—they don't buy them?—They buy books, little histories, the lives of saints, things of that kind.

19984. Is it a common thing for them to amuse themselves in the schools in the evenings by reading these books?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the peasantry in that respect to say.

19985. Have you known instances of one member of a family reading a book for the amusement of the others?—If I take my own family I can instance it, but I don't mix so with the peasantry as to be able to answer for them in general.

19986. Mr. Stalen.—With regard to the demand of the Catholic bishops for denominational inspection, do you not think it has reference to the denominational system of schools generally which the bishops ask for at the same time that they ask for denominational inspection?—We, as National teachers, don't wish to interfere in that question at all. We would rather leave that to be managed by those whose business it is to manage it.

19987. You have been asked questions on the subject. Are you aware that the Catholic Bishops have asked for the denominational system in schools generally?—I am aware of that.

19988. Was it not in reference to that general demand they asked for denominational inspection?—I presume it was; I cannot give you their opinions.

19989. Did you ever hear of a case of a convent school?—I think in Youghal—where the conduct of a Protestant Inspector was complained of?—I never heard it. I have no acquaintance with Youghal.

19990. Would you not regard the moral and religious results of the school as the most valuable consequences of the education imparted in the school?—Certainly.

19991. Do you think the moral and religious results

of the school could be calculated on with any certainty unless the managers of the school had complete control of the teachers?—I think it hard to say they would.

19992. Do you not believe there are many cases which would induce a manager to dismiss a teacher, and rightly so, which he would not be prepared to prove before a board of inquiry?—I am of opinion it would be better for the teacher they would be withheld from the light.

19993. Have you ever heard that inquiries held by the Board's Inspectors are not satisfactory?—I don't know of any instance.

19994. Have you not heard that inquiries have often to be repeated—that by the District Inspector, then by the Head Inspector, and sometimes by two Inspectors, before any result can be arrived at?—I am not aware.

19995. Is case of an inquiry conducted before the Board's officers, in any oath administered to the witnesses?—Never having been present, I don't know.

19996. Do you know in there any power to compel the attendance of witnesses at such inquiries?—I am not prepared to say.

19997. Do you think if the judgment of the managers were liable to be considered and reversed by the Inspectors that the managers would continue to act in the capacity of managers of the schools?—It would be hard for a teacher to continue under a manager against whom there was an adverse decision.

19998. Is not the teacher the servant of the manager?—To a certain extent.

19999. Is he not in his employment?—I am not aware of an instance.

20000. In whose employment is the teacher?—Though somewhat remotely, I think he is in the employment of the Commissioners of Education, the manager being an intermediate step.

20001. Who appoints the teacher?—The manager, subject to the approval of the Commissioners.

20002. Who dismisses the teacher?—The Commissioners have as much power to dismiss as the managers. The managers may do it summarily. The Commissioners may do it negatively, because they can withdraw the salary, and there is no use in a teacher continuing when the salary is withdrawn. Therefore I respectfully submit the Commissioners have the power of dismissal in that way.

20003. When the Board withdraws the salary, does not the teacher, in fact, retire?—As a matter of necessity.

20004. It is not the Board which dismisses, but the teacher, facing the loss of his income, naturally withdraws?—But I look upon that as virtual dismissal.

20005. What do you conceive to be the object for which the schools are maintained?—For the education of the peasantry, chiefly of the poorer classes, and to disseminate education throughout the country.

20006. Is not the end to teach the children rather than to find a place for the master?—I think that is comprised in my answer.

20007. Do you not think the payment of the teacher should be regulated by the degree of success which the teacher has attained?—To a certain extent, and I think that to some extent that exists already in the present system of education. The teacher must present the result, and when a judicious inspector comes to examine the school he must see that a certain result has been arrived at by the teacher. That is payment by results in a certain way.

20008. Have you compared or contrasted the condition of the teachers with that of the store-master?—Yes.

20009. Does the teacher serve an apprenticeship?—It is much like an apprenticeship that he spent nearly the whole of his previous life at school to attain to the knowledge of teaching that he possesses.

20010. As soon as he had begun to teach as a monitor, does he not draw some pay?—Yes, something from the Board.

20011. Does the same happen to a store-master's

Nov. 22, 1888.  
Mr. Patrick O'Callaghan.

Nov 29, 1926

Mr. Patrick  
O'Callaghan

apprentice?—Yes. The stone-mason demands some fees from the employer for him.

20012. Is it not the case that the parent of the boy pays a fee to the stone-mason when apprenticing him, and that the boy receives nothing for a few years?—Yes. He may pay an apprentice fee or not.

20013. Does not the young stone-mason make greater sacrifices to get into his business than the schoolmaster is called on to give to his?—I think the amount the young schoolmaster has to spend on his own education exceeds what the stone-mason has to spend.

20014. What does a young stone-mason earn as soon as he becomes a journeyman?—I should think what a journeyman mason is about 24s. a week.

20015. For how many hours has he to work in the day?—About ten.

20016. Then he earns less than sixpence an hour?—I believe so.

20017. What does the young schoolmaster earn in the year?—The average they begin on is £15.

20018. How many weeks' holidays has he?—That is regulated by the manager. There is no fixed rule on that. It is competent for the manager to make it, subject to the approval of the Commissioners; but, I believe, in general there is a week, and often a fortnight or so, at Midsummer and a fortnight at Christmas—that is four or five weeks as a rule. There may be some more, some less.

20019. He would not be working in his school for more than forty-eight weeks in the year?—No; in general.

20020. How much would he earn in the week, doing forty-eight working weeks?—Divide forty-eight into £15.

20021. Give me the average per week?—80s. shillings and three pence.

20022. And how many days in the week does he work?—Six days.

20023. Is there any school on Saturday?—There is.

20024. Is there any secular instruction on Saturday?—In some cases there is, the attendance is small, but the school is open.

20025. But the master is not bound to give any instruction on Saturday?—I don't know whether he is bound or not, but it is done.

20026. Is it universal, or even common, for schools to be open on Saturday for secular instruction?—It is quite common for secular instruction; for a certain part of the day in country schools.

20027. Is it not usual that schools are open for four hours for five days in the week for secular instruction?—It is for more than four hours; it is for five hours.

20028. Does the secular instruction extend for more than four hours?—It does, five hours. Pardon me—allow me to qualify that statement—it is five hours for one half of the year and four and a half hours for the other half.

20029. For how many hours in the week do you give secular instruction in your school?—I give five hours for one half of the year, and four hours and a half for the other half, for five days of the week, and a small portion of Saturday.

20030. Do you give five hours to secular instruction every day?—Yes. Pardon me again, I said for one half of the year five hours, and the other half four hours and a half.

20031. When you say five hours is not that the whole time for which your school is open?—For five days in the week for secular instruction.

20032. Is not part of that confined to religious instruction after the usual?—It is.

20033. It is the rule for you to give five hours for one half the year?—It is.

20034. Don't you give more than some schoolmasters and longer than you are bound to give?—The Board restricts me at least to four hours, but I give more than the Board restricts me to.

20035. Do you think the young schoolmaster receives more than sixpence an hour for his work?—Perhaps he may.

20036. What is your whole salary?—I am after answering that. I believe 88s.

20037. Does that include everything you receive?—Everything connected with my school.

20038. Master Brooke—Do you make anything by private tuition?—Not now, I did many years ago. About perhaps twenty years ago.

20039. What was that worth when you had it?—At one time I was receiving £10 a year from one gentleman.

20040. Mr. Stokes—Have you any assistants in teaching your school?—I have two.

20041. Two assistants?—No; two paid assistants.

20042. Two assistants paid by the Board?—Yes.

20043. Mr. Gibson—What is the time the Board has appointed for religious instruction—is it on Saturday, only?—Not only on Saturday, but after the secular instruction every other day.

20044. Judge Dillon—On whose property is your school?—It is built on the property of an adjacent farmer.

20045. Who is the landlord?—A Mr. Hawkes, a gentleman.

20046. Does he live in the neighbourhood?—He does; he lives on the same townland.

20047. Does he take part in the school?—Not the slightest.

20048. Is your district, and in the province of Munster, as far as you are acquainted with it generally, as the managers of the schools principally the Roman Catholic clergymen of the parish?—They are, almost so.

20049. Are they almost universally so?—Of course there are exceptions.

20050. I say almost?—Almost universally, indeed.

20051. Now, let that fact, in your opinion, had any connection with the teachers at their meetings declining to bring forward any complaint against the managers having the complete control of the dismissal of the teachers, the fact that it is the Roman Catholic clergymen are the managers in your district?—I don't know any distinction between the managers of any sort.

20052. Had practically the fact that they are the Roman Catholic clergymen any connection, do you think, with the decision that the body came to of not putting forward any complaint as regards the managerial system, as you described it?—I know, of my own knowledge, that they have great confidence in the Roman Catholic clergy as managers.

20053. Do you think their non-complaining has arisen at all, in any degree from the fact that the managers in that district are principally the Roman Catholic clergymen?—In order to enable me to answer that question I must say that some of the complaints I have heard are against Roman Catholic clergymen.

20054. Do you think that these complaints would have been taken up more warmly by the body generally if the managers had not been the Roman Catholic clergymen of the district?—I don't think that, because I think the complaints of the managers were made without considering who the managers are, just simply as managers.

20055. What did I understand you as saying to Dr. Wilson that the teachers had needed lately from contemplating of the management—from that point of view?—I don't know that say have received from it. My own conviction is still as it was—my own conviction is as it was before I was even nominated.

20056. The Chairman—You speak of the average numbers in those schools being smaller in Ireland than they are in England; do you consider that has arisen from the schools in your neighbourhood being planted too close to one another?—No, I do not; but that the population is decreasing every day is one of the causes; it is the contrary in every country.

20057. Do you think that if the schoolmasters were to make a practice of asking for a month's notice when they engage themselves to the school, they would have any difficulty in making that custom general?—I don't see any difficulty.

20058. How could it be made objectionable, making

general?—I think there would be no difficulty in making it general.

20079. Then, is not that a grievance which the schoolmasters can, to a considerable extent, remedy themselves?—So far as that part of it goes, they could.

20080. Do you know many cases in which, either through the absence or carelessness of the managers, caused the master's salary to be delayed in its payment?—I never knew an instance of it; an instance might come to my hearing, but I never knew of it myself.

20081. It is not a general grievance in your neighbourhood?—I don't think it is.

20082. You were asked some questions as to the amount of reading that takes place in the cottages; are many newspapers circulated amongst the poor people?—The grown people may buy a certain number of a newspaper and read it for themselves.

20083. Do the people who are working the weekly wages, any of them, take as a newspaper regularly, or buy one of them generally?—They buy one generally, and read it on Sunday or so.

20084. Mr. Seddons.—What is the opinion of the teachers with regard to the subjects of examination for classification?—They think that they are greatly clogged by so many subdivisions of the classes—and it is very disheartening to go through all the grades. It is a very difficult programme.

20085. Do they think there are too many subjects for examination?—Well, really, I am not prepared to answer that question. I am not aware what their feelings are in that respect. The only thing I heard them speaking about is the number of grades for classification.

20086. They would prefer to retain to the old system of a fewer number of grades?—Yes.

20087. How many grades do you think would be best?—I think if there was one in each of second and third, and two in the first, it would suit. I am giving my own opinion.

20088. Do you know what the opinion of the teachers would be on that subject?—I think they would agree with me generally on that.

20089. How many must be at present in a school, or in average attendance, to entitle a teacher of first class to an assistant?—Eighty I believe.

20090. Is that the minimum number?—As far as my memory serves me I think it is.

20091. Are you aware what the difference would be between the average number that would get an assistant in a model school, and an ordinary school?—I don't know that with regard to the model schools, but the number in the ordinary schools is sixty for an assistant, and seventy-five for two.

20092. Have you heard any observation made by the teachers as to its being a grievance that a higher average should be required in the common schools than in the model schools?—I have not heard that. The only grievance with regard to the model schools they feel is, that the teacher of the model school is now entitled to a pension, and we are not; and we cannot see the reason.

20093. You cannot see the reason for the difference between the two?—We cannot see the reason why we should not be entitled to a pension.

20094. In your part of the country are there any exemptions made with regard to the fees of the pupils?—That is, the non-payment of them?

20095. The non-payment?—A very large number.

20096. How is that managed? How is it a child in your district become exempted? Is it your own act or that of the manager?—I can never press for them. I would be injuring education in the district thereby.

20097. Is it your own act or the manager's?—The managers would rather I would be paid. The parents offer a sort of negative instance to paying, and if I did sanction the parents to the Petty Sessions or Quarter Sessions to enforce the payment, they would withdraw the children and I should become impotent.

20098. In fact, the exemption is a matter for yourself rather than for the patron?—It is, rather than

injure my school, and withhold education from persons for whom it is most intended.

20099. Do I understand that the patron never exempts people without consulting you?—As a rule, when he wants to enter the pupil gratuitously, he brings the parent forward in my presence.

20100. And in that case, is any attempt made to compensate you for the exemption?—No.

20101. In your part of the country are many of the schoolmasters receiving extra aid in the form of collections?—Very few. There are some that are receiving subscriptions through the hands of the patrons of the schools, but they are very few.

20102. Who are the parties that generally subscribe in your district?—In my district I am one to my knowledge. There is a Mr. Clarke, a tobaccoist, that did so for one year, but he withdrew it soon after. It was not in my school, but in a school in the neighbourhood.

20103. Do any of the landlords in the neighbourhood?—As a rule they do not.

20104. What is the general feeling with regard to the relationship between the teachers in your district and the managers; do they work well together?—In my district they do.

20105. Has it been at all a subject discussed—the relationship of the managers?—It has been raised down in the county of Clare and other parts, in some instances. There were some instances put forward of a grievance they considered they were labouring under.

20106. Taken as a whole in your part of the country, is there any substantial grievance in regard to the relationship between the teacher and the manager?—I am after answering the noble Chairman on that head, that not during my whole experience of thirty years, have I known an instance of it.

20107. Have you ever thought with regard to an increase of pay, whether it would be more acceptable in the form of an actual sum of money, or in the form of a house with some land attached?—In some cases where it would be feasible, the house and land attached would be a very great boon to the teacher, but it is very hard to accomplish that. I think to accomplish that should be by a special Act of Parliament to compel the landlord adjoining to give it, which would be a difficult thing.

20108. Suppose that it was practicable—that it could be done, which would be preferred by the teacher?—That would depend on the locality, often the nature of the soil, the value of the land.

20109. Supposing that in one case you got a fixed sum, and in the other an equivalent in house and land?—I really think that the house and field or garden would be preferable.

20110. Do you think that would be the opinion of the teachers?—I could not answer that question, indeed, because such a question never arose. I am only giving my own individual opinion.

20111. Do you think for the benefit of the teachers and for the schools it would be better?—For the benefit of the schools and the teachers it would be better—for the benefit of the schools more particularly, for I can give you instances of great hardships to teachers where there was no residence, nor even lodgings. I can give numbers of instances. I know a female teacher in the same district whose manager went to the farmers round to get her lodgings—it is not convenient to the farmers to let lodgings—and that teacher had to sleep in the school-room without any sleeping accommodation. Moreover, the very same teacher, the female teacher I speak of, has to travel a distance of about a mile and a half to and from school, for the want of a suitable lodging or house attached to the school. That is not a solitary case.

20112. Then in cases where they have not a residence of their own, is not the general style of the accommodation of the National teachers, when they are obliged to take lodgings, very bad?—Very bad; and in addition to that, you just recalled me of another instance too, where some young men, assistant teachers, coming to a locality, and it very difficult to get lodgings. In order to procure those lodgings, they are

See 36, 100a.  
Mr. Patrick O'Callaghan

Nov. 30, 1885.  
 From  
 Mr. Patrick  
 O'Donoghue.

obliged to go to a farmer's house, and pay so much a week out of their scanty purses, and besides that, they instruct the younger members of the family, thus depriving themselves of the time required for their own improvement.

20004. *The Chairman*.—Are there many female teachers who would be in a position to furnish and keep a house by themselves?—I don't know of any; they are very poor.

20004. Would not the question of providing a house be more a convenience to the master than to the mistress?—It is in illustration of that I give the instance. They are not in a position to furnish the house.

20005. *Mr. Sullivan*.—But would a master?—Sincerely. They would be able to trump up some sort of furniture of a very mean degree, that is, if I am to understand they are to have the houses provided for them. That is the way I understood the question of his lordship.

20006. *The Chairman*.—As regards the question of a house, do you think the advantage is as great to a female teacher as to a male?—I do not.

20007. The majority of female teachers being unmarried women and often young women, is it not more suitable in most cases, and more convenient to them, to be lodged than house occupiers?—Undoubtedly, provided they could find suitable lodgings.

20008. *Mr. Walshev*.—Do you consider it desirable to have a piece of land attached to the schoolmaster's residence?—I do.

20009. What extent of ground do you think desirable if it was feasible?—I think two acres very desirable, but I think it would be very difficult to secure two acres.

20010. Not exceeding two acres, you think, would be desirable?—The more the better.

20011. Assuming that the house was found for you, and that the piece of land was attached to it, would you consider that the master teaching the pupils agriculture in a small way—that if he was given the land, rent free, it would be an inducement to many teachers to teach agriculture to the pupils?—I do.

20012. Do you think, in that way, a knowledge of agriculture would be very cheaply extended over the country?—I think it would be a very great advantage to the present system of agriculture if it were extended, as it were, incidentally amongst the people.

20013. *The Chairman*.—How much land do you say that a master, having 100 boys in the room, could attend to without neglecting his school?—The time that he would appropriate to the land should be entirely apart from the time that is devoted to the school; it should be so without detriment to the school.

20014. How much land do you think a man with a school of that size could hold without being tempted to withdraw himself from the school too much?—Viewing it in that light I don't think it would be desirable he should hold more than two acres.

20015. *Judge Morris*.—Do the managers of the schools with which you are acquainted ever visit them?—As a rule my own manager visits every day—the present manager; the late manager used not to do it so often, so that—once or twice a week, but generally the managers do visit the schools very frequently.

20016. In the neighbourhood with which you are acquainted?—In the neighbourhood, as far as my acquaintance goes.

20017. And from what you heard from the teachers, in conversing about it, is it a fact the managers do visit the schools?—Yes, from my acquaintance with the teachers around me is my own district.

20018. When they do visit schools, what supervision do they exercise over them?—They stand and listen to a class; some managers will examine it themselves, and see what progress the children have made at their lessons and in order and regularity.

20019. *Mr. Sullivan*.—Have you ever considered the question of substituting the theory of agriculture in the school—of substituting the agricultural Reading Book in place of the ordinary Reading Book?—We

have introduced that book lately through the Commissioners. The Commissioners have recommended it, and we have taken up the book.

20020. What is your opinion of the introduction of such a book?—I like it very much for the farming population.

20021. Do you think it will conduce both to teach them reading and give them good views on agriculture?—I am sure it will improve their views of agriculture very much, and will not in the slightest degree interfere with the teaching how to read. They can be as efficiently taught reading from that as from the Third, Fourth, or Fifth Book.

20022. How far does your opinion agree with that of the teachers of your district?—Well, I have not had an opportunity of hearing their opinions on that book. I never had to exchange ideas with any man but one, and it wasn't much exchanging ideas with him either, but I happened to go into a school in my vicinity and he was teaching his class at the time, and from the interest he took in the book, he appeared to entertain the same views as I do myself.

20023. *The Chairman*.—Do many boys who have been in the school lose the power of reading and writing when they have left it for two or three years?—Not those that get into the third, or fourth, and fifth class—those that graduate through those don't lose it, they improve on it.

20024. *Mr. Sullivan*.—Those who only reach the beginning of the Third Book—do you think they do?—The master the Second Book that we have at present is no more than in reading.

20025. Do you think those going only through half the new Second?—Perhaps not half but two-thirds of the new Second. I think the boy that can master the present Second Book is no competent a reader as the boy that mastered one-half of the old Third Book.

20026. Which do you prefer the newer class-books or the old ones merely as to the graduation of the lessons for teaching purposes?—As far as matter is concerned I prefer the latter, having used the former merely for the purpose of teaching reading. The old are somewhat simpler for a child or a youth.

20027. Don't mind the matter. Do you think the lessons graduate better?—In the old series, yes; as it were dovetailed better into each other; but I don't say that in condemnation of the present books at all.

20028. *Mr. Walshev*.—Do not fewer forget reading and writing after they leave school, under the new system than formerly?—I think so. Though not having sufficient time to make the experiment, my opinion is that the boy who will master the Second Book, as he goes into the Third, is as good a reader as the boy who went formerly through half the Third Book.

20029. *The Chairman*.—When you give the children religious instruction, do you merely have some of the catechisms, or do you ask questions in them?—They must get the catechism by heart, and therefore dole out questions arising from that are often asked.

20030. You are in the habit of asking them questions. Is it when they have learned it?—To test their knowledge of the questions—that I may satisfy myself that they do know the catechism.

20031. Do you ask questions to see whether they understand the meaning of the answers?—I do.

20032. How many catechisms do you generally teach the children?—One at present. There was formerly an abridgement of that one, and we have done away with that.

20033. What is the name of the catechism?—It is called the General Catechism of the Christian Doctrine, by Dr. Butler, and Flannery's Historical Catechism.

20034. How low down in the school do the children learn the whole of that?—They are all obliged to learn both before they are eligible for confirmation—to know the whole of them.

20035. But now your children that were in the Second Book, how far would they have gone in it?—They would get through the whole of it.

20036. And recollect it fairly by heart?—Yes; but



in the process of time there is a general class for them all, to keep up their knowledge of it.

20127. Does the manager ever give religious instruction in the school-house?—No, in the chapel.

20128. Is that on the Sunday or on the Saturday?—Generally on the Sunday, in the chapel.

20129. Mr. Webb—How many of you scholars read the agricultural book?—The fourth and fifth class at present. There are sixteen in the two classes, and as many as are present of those two classes read it.

20130. Do they give their attention to it?—They like it very much.

20131. They prefer it to their reading book?—I would not go so far as to say prefer, but they like it very much.

20132. Do you think the advanced portion of the third class could master the Agricultural Class Book?—I have not tried them. I am endeavouring to bring up those in the Third Book to a respectable position. Being a new compilation, it is rather difficult with them at first.

20133. With regard to the local statistics, what time do you occupy every day in keeping them up? How much of your time does it occupy?—Monday is the most difficult day, when new boys are coming in, and whose names I must put on the register and class roll. That occupies more time on that day than any other day, the ordinary time being not more than ten minutes to a quarter of an hour.

20134. Do the teachers consider it a grievance that they have to fill so many forms?—I never heard of it. I know that formerly, when they were very numerous, they did not think they should be required to fill them without compensation; but the Board have relieved them in a great measure from these statistics.

20135. The Chairman—Do you think the forms are now as simple as they can be?—I could not pronounce an opinion on that, but they have simplified them still in a great degree.

20136. Mr. Sullivan—Is it a practical grievance to be obliged to supply such an amount of statistics as is now done?—I never looked on it as a grievance. I looked on it as part of the regular business of the school, and I complied with the request of the Board.

20137. The Chairman—Part of the machinery of the school?—Part of the machinery of the school, for no school can be well conducted without statistics.

20138. Mr. Sullivan—And the amount you think is not too great?—I do not think it is.

20139. Has that been a subject which occupied the attention of the teachers?—No; it never came to my ears from them, except as I remarked a while ago, that formerly when very large returns were put on us, we thought it was a grievance that we should not be allowed something for it.

20140. You never got any payment for making those large returns?—Not a farthing.

[Adjourned.]

New 20, 1868.  
Mr. Patrick  
O'Connell

# FIFTY-SECOND DAY—DUBLIN, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1868.

## PRESENT.

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DENHAM, R. P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLOSING, R.  
The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MOLES.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, B. R.

WILLIAM BRIDGES, Esq., M.C.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASHBYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C.; }  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq., } Secretaries.

STEPHEN DE VARE, Esq., sworn and examined.

Dec. 1, 1868.  
Stephen  
De Vare, esq.

20141. The Chairman—I believe you represented the county of Limerick for some years in Parliament?—Yes, my lord.

20142. Do you act as a magistrate in that county?—Yes.

20143. I believe you are Chairman of the Board of Guardians?—Of Rathkeale Board of Guardians.

20144. Have you given a good deal of attention to the practical working of the National system?—Yes; I have had considerable opportunities in a small way of making myself acquainted with the practical working of the present system.

20145. I believe you have taken an interest in looking after the management of individual schools in the county?—Yes; upon my brother's property in the county of Limerick. I have been for a great many years, almost, I should say, since the commencement of the National system, manager of the school upon that property. Subsequently I became local manager and de facto manager of all Lord Montagu's schools, which were eight in number, and for many years I had the entire management of those schools.

20146. Were any of those schools on the two properties mentioned, schools in which there was much admixture of denominations among the pupils?—In my own school, Kilmoran school, there was a considerable admixture. A good many of the Protestant farmers of the neighbourhood sent their children to the school. I may mention to your lordship that I took a very peculiar interest in the management of

that school, and that I generally, for several years resided in instructing the head class of the school myself.

20147. In that school did you find any difficulties arise as regards the rules of the Board, connected with religious instruction, from the admixture of religions in the school?—None whatever; I found no pressure of any kind put upon the Protestant children, who constituted the minority in the school. There was not a single instance of any attempt either successful or unsuccessful to alter their religious opinions, and my strong conviction is that the association of the Protestant and Catholic children in that school has been productive of very happy consequences in producing union and sympathy between them in after-life.

20148. Were the Protestant children of rather a higher class than the majority of the Roman Catholic children of that school?—No, they were of the same class.

20149. Small farmers?—Small farmers.

20150. Were they families that had been for years in the neighbourhood or that had recently come from other parts of the country to that farm?—They had been for many many years, for generations, in the district. In some instances they were the descendants of the old palatine settlers.

20151. Was the teacher in this particular school always a Roman Catholic?—Always.

20152. Were the teachers in all the other schools

Dec. 1, 1863.  
 Stephen  
 De Vane, esq.

that you superintended Roman Catholics?—They were all Roman Catholics in Lord Montagu's schools. The proportion of the Roman Catholic to Protestant scholars was very much larger in Lord Montagu's schools than in Kilkenny school.

20183 And so far as your experience goes that did not make the Protestant families reluctant to send their children to any of those schools?—Not at all. If your lordship will allow me I will mention an instance that occurred in one of Lord Montagu's schools which was almost exclusively frequented by Roman Catholics. There was a young child, the son of a Scotch build. His father went to Australia with the family, and this child was too young to go. This child was brought up as a Protestant, was adopted by the teacher of one of the schools who was himself a Catholic. That child continued to be educated, got his whole education at the National school, and that child has now received a perfectly good education, and his faith has never been interfered with in any respect in the school. He was adopted by the Catholic teacher and brought up in his family as his child.

20184 What is your opinion as to the results of the system from the commencement to the present time?—They have been on the whole successful. I think they have been eminently successful. I think they have to a most extraordinary degree developed the character and the intellect of the people. I think that the progress that has been made in this country during the thirty years, which is very great, is owing in a very considerable degree to the education that the people have received under the National system.

20185 Is the dialect with which you are connected one in which the Irish language is much spoken?—It is spoken and understood by the parents, by what I may call the passing generation. It is not understood by the rising generation.

20186 At the time of the institution of the National Board, say in 1832, were there many of the grown people who were ignorant of English?—At that time a generation existed which has now passed away, and that generation, that is, the grandfathers of the rising generation and the fathers of what I have called the now passing generation, almost universally spoke Irish.

20187 Were many of them ignorant of English?—Yes, a great many.

20188 Have the National schools had powerful influence in extending knowledge of English in those parts of the country?—If your lordship wishes to ask me whether they have had an influence in substituting the English for the Irish language, I should say that they have not had that effect, but that if your question refers me to the greater knowledge of the English language that they have obtained from the better system of education, I should say certainly that they have obtained a greater knowledge of the English language, but not to the destruction or obliteration of the Irish language.

20189 I spoke with reference to adding a knowledge of the English language to the Irish, and thereby opening a wider field of employment for the rising generation?—No doubt that has been the effect. I should wish very much that we could have had that effect without the loss of the old language. I would venture to suggest to the Commissioners that it would be very advisable that the State, which has the control of the education of the country, should make some provision for saving the fine old Irish language from being entirely destroyed and obliterated; whether that can be done through the means of primary education or whether it could be better done by other means I am not prepared to say.

20190 Are you an advocate for the schools being taught in Irish?—No, my lord, I am not.

20191 Have you any personal experience of the model training schools?—No, my experience of the model schools has been confined to a few occasional visits to the model school at Limerick, but I have had no concern whatever with their operation.

20192 Do you consider the existing model schools efficient as training schools for masters or teachers?—

No; under present circumstances I do not consider them so. It is a notorious fact that they are not used to a great extent for the training of teachers. It is a notorious fact that the Board is now obliged to employ a great number of teachers who have not been trained, and I look upon that as the necessary consequence of the non-vested system of schools.

20193 In what way does the non-vested system operate in giving employment for untrained masters?—I should rather say, my lord, that the non-vested system is to a great degree inhospitable to the employment of trained teachers. Teachers trained in the model schools are trained for the purpose of conducting schools under the vested system, and not so well under the non-vested system. I should therefore strongly advocate the superadding to the present model schools a system of non-vested training schools, which would rear up a body of teachers who would be more in harmony with the general working of the system in Ireland.

20194 The reason of the falling off of numbers in the model schools, to which you refer, is the dislike entertained to the existing system of them by the Roman Catholic bishops?—Certainly.

20195 Supposing training colleges existed which were satisfactory to the Roman Catholics, would not the masters trained in those schools be equally good either for vested or non-vested schools?—I think that they would be perfectly suitable for vested schools, but I think that they would be better suited for non-vested schools than the teachers who were trained in the existing model schools.

20196 Are not the rules as to secular teaching in the vested and non-vested schools identical?—Yes.

20197 Then what are the points in which you think that different qualifications are either required or sought for in teachers of vested or non-vested schools?—In the non-vested schools, if I am right, a great amount of religious education is given directly under the authority of the managers, and that is to a great extent given by the teachers. I think that the managers of non-vested schools would have, and would rightly have, a greater confidence for the imparting of that distinct religious education in the teachers who had been educated in non-vested model schools under their own inspection.

20198 Do you think that it would be desirable that the State should encourage religious bodies or voluntary associations to maintain training schools themselves, receiving, as in England, so much for each pupil that they maintained, or that passed satisfactory examinations under the Board's examiners?—That is not exactly the system that I should think the best. I should rather prefer that the non-vested training schools should be conducted upon the same principles as the non-vested ordinary schools. If I understood your lordship's question right, it would be that the assistance given by the State to the non-vested training schools should be in proportion to the number of the pupils sent out who might show capacities for teaching.

20199 Yes. That they should receive so much a year for each teacher who passed a satisfactory examination at the conclusion of the year or half year, and so much for every teacher who obtained a class under the National Board at the conclusion of his course?—I think that that payment by results, which it would be, would be very useful if superadded to a fixed assistance given in the usual way to the school; but I do not think it would be a good way of giving State contribution to the non-vested schools if taken by itself.

20200 I presume that any change in the model schools as regards the training of pupils, to be satisfactory to the Roman Catholics, would require that they should be of a more denominational character?—The non-vested schools, whether model or ordinary schools, partake in some degree of a denominational character, but I must object to the use of the non-denominational as applied to them. The non-vested schools are in fact not denominational schools, because

though they may operate occasionally as denominational schools, yet they are framed upon a code of rules which exclude their being denominational.

20171. How would you suggest that training schools entirely under the management of the State should be established to meet the objections of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to the present system?—I am not sufficiently acquainted with the practices and rules of the Board to give a very distinct answer to your lordship's question. I should merely say that there should be a permission to all parties that chose to make the application to institute non-vested training schools, under the express condition that these training schools were to be conducted strictly according to the rules of the National system.

20172. These model schools being non-vested would receive no assistance for building?—Certainly not. I do not think it would be just or reasonable to give State assistance to a structure that might cease to be the property of the State in a very short time.

20173. In whom would you vest the appointment of the teachers and masters of such non-vested training schools?—According to the analogy of the ordinary non-vested schools, I would vest them in the parents and managers of the schools.

20174. And how do you secure their efficiency as training schools? Would you make the annual payments to them dependent on the favourable report of the Inspector?—I would, of course, recognise the right of the Board of Education to withdraw the grant if the results were not such as justified them in continuing it. That is, I believe, the principle applied to the ordinary non-vested schools.

20175. Should you consider the manner in which that was to be effected a matter of detail to be elaborated in the regulations of the Board?—Undoubtedly.

20176. Do you consider the elementary teaching given by the ordinary schools, in reading, writing, and arithmetic, efficient and successful?—Extremely so. I think it has been proved by the answer that I had the honour of giving your lordship a short time ago as to the results of the system. Those results—those very great results—could never have been accomplished if the system of teaching in the schools had not been essentially good.

20177. Do you consider the operation of the ordinary schools as being satisfactory in improving the manners and behaviour of the children?—Yes. I do not think you can educate the mind without, at the same time, educating the manners. The manners of the people have improved, and I think that their moral character has improved.

20178. In the district with which you are acquainted have the schools had any effect in promoting the greater cleanliness and tidiness of the cottages, or as regards the children's clothes?—It is hard to say how far the improvement that has taken place is owing to the teaching that has taken place in the schools of the system. I am perfectly aware that a very great progressive improvement in those respects is observable in the country. It varies very much in different parts of the country. Now, there is a most extraordinary difference in those respects between the county of Limerick and the neighbouring county, which I am almost equally well acquainted with, which is Kerry. There is 30 years' difference in point of cleanliness and attention to personal appearance with respect to the individuals themselves, and their houses, and the care of their cattle, between the two counties, although they are contiguous.

20179. Which is the most advanced county?—Limerick is much more advanced.

20180. Earl of Devonport.—Would you not say that in the county of Kerry the progress has been proportionate to the backward state it was in when the National system was introduced?—I should say, my lord, rather greater, but they started from a very different point.

20181. The Chairman.—Do you consider that the progress which you mention as being so considerable

in these two counties is partly owing to the schools, and partly owing to the increased material prosperity of the small cultivators?—I think the increased material prosperity is in a great degree attributable to the education and development of the people's character and intellect, so that in that way my answer to your lordship's question is, that that has been the result, but by indirect means.

20182. Have you any personal knowledge of any of the agricultural schools under the Board?—I have considerable acquaintance with one of what I may call the minor agricultural schools. It is one of the schools upon Lord Montagu's estate.

20183. What is the name of that school?—It is the Mount Trenchard Model School.

20184. What is the extent of its farm?—I think it is about twenty or twenty-five acres; I cannot speak with accuracy as to its extent.

20185. Is that school popular among the small farmers in the neighbourhood, or is it, as some persons have suggested to us of agricultural schools in general, looked upon as a device of the landlords to raise the rents?—It is not looked upon as that sense at all; but I cannot conceal from myself the fact that as a training model agricultural school for boarding pupils it has been a failure, as well as all the schools of the same class that I am acquainted with.

20186. Do you think any of the neighbouring farmers have taken any hint as to cultivation of their land from what they see done on the model farm?—No, I do not. They have derived immense assistance in draining, and other operations from the friendly advice from the teacher of the model farm. His establishment amongst them in that way has been of very great advantage to them; but I do not think that they have derived much advantage from seeing before their eyes operations upon the model farm.

20187. Is the draining you speak of carried on by the landlord or tenant, or both?—It is carried on by both. These is a united system, the landlord giving a certain contribution to the expense of the drainage. I am speaking now not of drainage upon the model agricultural farm, but drainage upon the surrounding country.

20188. Have those drains been stone drains or pipe drains?—Partly one and partly the other, according to the capability of the country for producing stone. In the parts of the country that produce stone stone drains have been used.

20189. To what cause do you attribute the failure of the agricultural school as a place for training boys?—I think that these minor agricultural model schools—I am not speaking of the great ones, but of the minor ones—are too small to teach scientific agriculture, and I think that they are too small also in proportion to the amount of capital which has been laid out upon their building. I think that the farmers around them say, "This is no example to us, because our capital does not enable us to apply the same means of developing the resources of the ground that we see before us. Therefore this is a thing that though we may admire, we cannot copy."

20190. What is your opinion of the school-farms not exceeding five acres?—If your lordship would allow me to couple that with the question of the teachers' salaries, I think that the two will be best answered together. I should be then prepared to give to the Commissioners my idea of how the deficiency of the salaries may be provided for by a small system of cultivation, under special liability, and particularly of kitchen gardens, in connexion with the teachers' residences.

20191. Do you consider that it would be desirable to give persons having limited interests in lands, under settlement, power either to give or to lease sites for schools?—Undoubtedly, my lord; but I would go a great deal further. I cannot conceive a greater evil than that the beneficial effects of the National system of education should be interrupted and impeded by the difficulty of finding sites. That difficulty is not confined to the difficulty arising from settlements. It very often results from the unwillingness of landlords to give sites.

Dec. 7, 1886.  
Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

for a system which they disapprove of. In such cases I would suggest that the Board of Education should seek, at the hands of the Legislature, for compulsory power of taking sites for schools, with such qualifications and such restrictions as might be thought just.

20192. Supposing such compulsory power to be given, what protection would you give to the landowner so that a site should not be taken compulsorily, which might be disagreeable to him as a residential point of view, as he a site mainly valuable, or as a site so situated as to accommodate either himself or any of the occupants under him?—I think the best protection that the landowner would have would be the good feeling and the good sense, and the true reasonable application of principles on the part of the Board of Education itself. I do not think that the Board of Education would—I feel that they would not—allow a site to be taken that would be peculiarly painful and displeasing to any person; and I feel convinced that they would have too much good sense to take a place that would be peculiarly valuable, because as they would have to pay for it according to its value, it would be very bad economy. Beyond this I would say that the only protection I would give the landed proprietors would be whatever protection the law gives them in the regulations now in which compulsory powers are vested, I believe, in the Government for taking sites for coast-guard houses. Whatever the precautions taken in that case were, I should be perfectly willing to apply them to this case.

20193. Are you aware whether these compulsory powers you speak of with regard to taking sites for coast-guard stations are peculiar to Ireland, or whether they are the same that exist in England?—I am not aware, my lord.

20194. What is your opinion of the books of the National Board?—I think that the books, on the whole, are very good. I think that the results of the education, so far, prove that the books are good. I think they may be improved.

20195. I believe the extensive use of the National Board books is not a matter of compulsion, but has been produced by compulsion?—I have always understood that whilst the managers of National schools are not obliged to have any particular books, such as No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, or No. 4, read in the school, and that in that sense the use of them is not compulsory, on the other hand they are not at liberty, so far as I am aware, certainly so far as my own practice is concerned, to introduce other books for the ordinary secular instruction in the school, which have not been approved of by the Board.

20196. Do you think it desirable under the present circumstances of Ireland that the books used should be practically of a uniform character, or that it would advance education if various sets of books were in use?—I should wish the books to be uniform as between school and school, but I should wish a greater variety of topics to be introduced into the books, and perhaps I may say a greater variety of gradations of classification in the books themselves.

20197. Do you consider that it is for the advantage of education in Ireland that the same books should be practically used in all the schools of a neighbourhood?—Certainly.

20198. In the district in which you had the management of schools is there much change of children from one school to another?—No; the children go to the school which is nearest to them. A great number of the children are very young, and it is a matter of very great importance to them not to have very far to go. They usually go to the school which is nearest, but there are instances in which one school nudes a higher character for instruction than another; and I generally find that the more advanced children will flock to that school.

20199. Are you aware of any instances of parents taking their children away suddenly from the school because they quarrelled with the master or disliked him?—I have known very few such instances. I should say that any manager of a school who allowed his

teacher to conduct himself in such a way as to justify the withdrawal of any children from any school, would be neglecting his own duty very much.

20200. How do you account for the smallness of the number of cases in which a free residence is given to the teacher?—Well, a free residence means a subscription. The local subscriptions are undoubtedly very small, unfortunately they are very small, I wish they were much larger than they are; but the giving of a free residence is just as much the giving of three or four or five pounds a year, as the giving of so much money, and therefore the answer to your lordship's question would be that the residences are not given, because there is not a general habit of giving local subscriptions to the schools. I believe that nothing would so much tend to improve the character and position of the teachers, and to exalt the whole system in its sphere of usefulness as the giving of fixed residences to the teachers, but let the rent be paid by the Board as an addition to the present salary.

20201. Then if the effect of the ordinary schools in improving and advancing the education and intelligence of the population is as considerable as you consider it to be, how do you account for the sparsity of land, even now and their unwillingness to give residences to the teachers?—They find the system working very well. They are unwilling to subscribe more for it than is absolutely necessary to what they consider the good working of the system. They have in most instances subscribed very largely to the erection of the school, and they are under the idea—I think a mistaken one—that the schools should then be self-supporting, or at least so far self-supporting as that they might be able to do without any assistance but the assistance which they receive from the Board. I think it a mistaken idea, and that if they were to give residences it would be much better.

20202. Do you consider that the comfort of having a residence near the school, and the advantage of a little plot of ground as garden ground, is to the teacher more than the mere pecuniary value of the house and garden?—It is a great deal more to the teacher—I mean to the pocket of the teacher—because he may make more out of that residence and the land attached to it, than he would make by receiving the rent of it into his pocket, infinitely more. But the benefit to the teacher will not stop there. It makes the teacher a fixed person. He is more circumspect in his conduct. He will do more to try to advance himself in the good opinion of those who are around him, and he will take more care to avoid bad company, and to avoid bad habits, because he knows that it would be the entire spoiling of his position in life, having once a fixed position.

20203. Considering that the number of schools in Ireland is now so large, do you think that the Board might advantageously make some stipulation as regards residences with respect to future applications for new schools?—Stipulation with whom?

20204. With the applicants who desire to found a new school?—I should say that that would be a very unworkable way of carrying out the object that I have in view. I think that it would be far better that the rent of these residences should be paid for by the State as part of the teachers' salaries, because I think that the salaries that they now receive are inadequate to the duties they have to perform.

20205. Considering the smallness of local contributions in the way of subscriptions of which you have already spoken, do you think it would be desirable that some contribution should be required from the locality by way of local rate?—No, I should entirely object to that.

20206. Why?—I think in the first place that it would make the education unpopular. I think if there was an education rate the people would grumble at it, and instead of looking upon it as a boon, they would look upon it as an onerous tied round their necks. People do not like taxation.

20207. If it were collected like the poor-rates, and fell partly on the owner and partly on the occupier, do

you think it would be unpopular with the small occupier whose children might derive aid from the school?—I think it would be unpopular, and I think it would be rightly unpopular. I think that the true principle of giving support to a State system of education is that it should be done out of the general funds of the State; and as the taxpayer in Ireland contributes to the assistance that is given to the maintenance and the support of education in England, I think that the taxpayer of England ought to contribute to the support of education in Ireland, and looking as I do upon the duty—I mean the duty incumbent upon the State—to maintain a due system of educating the people, I think that that ought to be done out of the general funds of the country, and not by local taxation.

20208. But while the schools in England get only very partial assistance on the part of the State, might not the State in Ireland require that a fair proportion of the total cost of education should be defrayed by local exertion in Ireland?—Your lordship's question opens out a very large subject, that perhaps it might not be advisable that I should enter into. I believe that the circumstances of the past history of Ireland, and the consequences of the denial of education to the people of Ireland, have been such that there is a great educational debt, as I may call it, due by the State to Ireland. I do not ask that the education of Ireland should be exclusively provided out of English funds, but I ask that Ireland, being a part of the great empire, the education of the people, as furnished by the State, should be supplied to a very large degree out of the general taxation of the whole empire.

20209. Do you consider that the Irish landowner is under any position of disability as compared with the English landowner, that would make it unfair to ask from him the same sort of assistance which the English landowner gives to the schools in his parish?—I think that the Irish landlord is generally much less able to pay additional taxation than the English landlord.

20210. Do you think the position of an Irish landowner is such as to throw upon him a smaller obligation than upon the English landowner to do something for the education of the people on his estate?—The Irish landowner has so very much to do in trying to bring up the condition of the country to anything like a parallel with the condition of England, that I think it is not well to put an extraordinary pressure upon him for the education of the people—that is, to remove from the State some of that duty which it has already undertaken.

20211. To what extent do you consider the teachers' salaries require improvement?—I cannot speak from any intimate acquaintance with the details of the matter, but I believe I am pretty right in saying that the salaries are something from £25 to £35. I am speaking of the ordinary country schools. In saying that, I exclude the salaries of the head teachers and of more prominent ones. To finish the answer to your lordship's question, I am not prepared to say to what extent in money it would be advisable to add to these salaries, but I am prepared to suggest three modes in which whatever increase the Board should think fit might be effected. These three modes are, first, paying the rent of a cottage, and attaching to the cottage, in the first instance, a small kitchen garden, say, a garden of from half an acre to three-quarters of an acre of land. That kitchen garden would, under my plan, form a most essential part of the education of the school. I believe that there is nothing that we are more deficient in, in this country, than poultry. The Irish people waste their food because they do not know how to cook it, and they do not know how to cook it because they do not understand, as they do in France and in other places, the use and the value of vegetables, in making their food go far, and be palatable and wholesome. I therefore think it would be a very essential improvement of the social condition of the people to teach them the use of a well-managed kitchen garden. I should make that, at the same time, a source of increased revenue to the schoolmaster

himself. I would make it incumbent upon him to instruct and lecture his school in the management of this kitchen garden; and I should require the Inspector of the Board, at all his visits, to take the scholars into the kitchen garden, and to find out whether they understood the management of it. Let it be part of the examination by the Inspector. I would then give to the teacher a pension according to the proficiency of his school in that examination, and to the state of his garden and of his house. The rent of the house being paid by the State, that rent would be withdrawn from the teacher if he did not keep his house and his kitchen garden in such a way as to be a real model of cleanliness and of profitable cultivation to the school and to the country. In that way, I think that I should add greatly to the wealth of the schoolmaster; I should add greatly to his moral position, and I should improve the education of the people of the country. Another way in which I think that a certain addition might be well made to the salary would be this—we will suppose, for argument's sake, that the maximum salary be left as it is; but I would suggest that there should be something appended to it for the results of the teaching. That should be given in the form of a premium, not merely for the efficiency of the scholars, and for the efficiency of the teaching, combined with the attendance at the school. I would make it the interest of the schoolmaster to encourage good attendance as much as it would be his interest to give good instruction. These would be two of the modes in which I think the schoolmaster's position could be improved. The third would be by establishing non-vested training schools. You will perceive that there is at present a great deficiency of trained teachers. That necessity throws the Board upon the employment of untrained teachers. These untrained teachers have their salaries according to their classification, so that the result of having untrained teachers is that we have low salaries. Thus, without any increase to the expenditure of the Board, except such increase as would be amply repaid by the increased efficiency of the teachers, you would, by the establishment of non-vested training schools, obtain higher salaries, and a better position for your teachers. These are the three modes in which I would humbly suggest that the position of the teachers might be improved.

20212. Do you think it would be desirable to adopt a practice analogous to that in England, by which the children are required to advance from class to class in such way, as to receive payment for results?—No; I should not think that desirable. A great many of the children are necessarily irregular in attendance. They are obliged to be employed upon their farms, and a great deal of this deficiency of attendance that we complain of is absolutely necessary, and in many instances it is not only justifiable but it is praiseworthy. I do not mean to defend bad attendance as a general rule. On the contrary good attendance is essential, but I think that we have sometimes kept too hard upon parents in requiring constant attendance upon the part of the children.

20213. Do not many of the children in the lower classes remain an unduly long time in those classes?—They do not remain what I should call an unduly long time, considering the habits of the very young children, before they have been brought into the school. They have got no instructions, they have got no habits of thought in their own homes before they come to the school, and the little creatures when they come into the school first and are put into the first or even the second class, remain there almost without learning for a long time. That I think is very unbecoming, my lord, to the want of education in their parents.

20214. Do you think that it might be practicable to put some pressure upon the masters that would cause them to bring the children through the first and second books more rapidly?—No; I do not see any pressure that can be put upon them that I think would work well.

20215. Do you consider the present system of inspection efficient?—So far as I have seen it, I think

Dec 1, 1906.

Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

Dec. 1, 1892.

Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

it very efficient and proper. The Inspectors are a most respectable body of men. They do their duty with great zeal and I think with great impartiality.

20216. Are you satisfied with the present system of inspection as a whole?—Perfectly.

20217. Earl of Devonport.—I suppose your attention has been turned to the fact that in some of the model schools there are children who are not considered to be properly objects of primary education?—Yes.

20218. Do you think yourself that that is well founded?—I do not think it is well founded as an objection. I do not think it is a fair objection, because I look upon our National school system as an open to all, and I should be very sorry to exclude any child from the benefits of this great system. I feel convinced that no great objection ever arose, because I think that the rich can always get by paying more a better education, and they perhaps wish for a more exclusive education.—I mean exclusive in a social sense; and therefore I think that no abuse will ever arise. I may also mention that I know many instances in which the children of what may be called the upper classes of life have been educated in some of the great model schools, and where it really was a matter of economy and of necessity with their parents that they should get cheap education. People are very often not so much as they are supposed to be; and I have known people in the higher, and professional ranks of life who were extremely glad to get a cheap education for their children in the model schools. I should be sorry to exclude them by any action of the Board or of the Legislature.

20219. Are there any other suggestions with respect to these non-voted training schools which you wish to make to the Commissioners?—No, my lord; I do not think there are any with respect to them. With respect to the ordinary schools I should wish, with your lordship's permission, to make a few additional suggestions. First of all with regard to the books.

20220. What suggestions have you to make with regard to the books?—I have lately read with very great pleasure the revised Fifth Book, and I find in it some lessons on the subject of Irish antiquities and Irish statistics—both Pagan and Christian antiquities. I think that these are very valuable lessons, and I am very glad to see them introduced; but I think the introduction of that species of literary knowledge ought not to be confined to the more advanced classes who read the Fifth Book. A great number of the children leave the school without ever reading the Fifth Book, and they are therefore deprived of this knowledge; and I should be very glad to see lessons in a more condensed and shorter form upon those subjects introduced into the Third and Fourth Books. I think that would be very advisable. I should be also very glad to see some lessons in history introduced into our National school books; I am aware that difficulties have been started, but I do not think that they are by any means insuperable.

20221. You mentioned just now that it would be a great boon to the masters to have these houses and kitchen gardens; do you consider it would be a great boon to them to have small farms?—I should wish to attach to the teacher's little residence a small farm that could be carried on upon the model of the Belgian system of *quatre bander*. I do not think it ought to exceed in the most two or three acres, and I should not propose that the State should be put to any expense for it. I think that the payment of the rent of that should be a matter between the teacher and the landlord from whom he took the land. I think that it ought to be brought within the jurisdiction of the school and within the inspection of the Board.

20222. In that case you do not consider that the size of the farm would interfere with the business of the school?—No; in looking at this matter first I was inclined to think that it would be a very dangerous thing, that it would be very dangerous as withdrawing the teacher from his duties, and that it would be very dangerous as making the parents fancy that their

children were sent to that school for purposes that really did not belong to their education at all. I think if you confine the quantity of the land to a very small amount, and if you take great care to prevent there being any compulsory employment of the children upon it, the danger may be got over, and the advantages will more than counterbalance all possible objection. In this country we are unfortunately shrouded into a condition of blindness in which, be it for good or be it for evil, we have a great number of small farms. Now we can only get out of these farms by a long process. Any attempt to consolidate these farms by a rapid action will, I think, tend to evil in more respects than one. I believe that as the capital of the country becomes developed the small holdings will naturally become consolidated in the hands of persons of large capital; but in the meantime I believe it is our duty to do all we can to make these possessors of small holdings cultivate them as I believe they may be cultivated profitably to themselves. We have got a system to deal with, we must make the best of it, and we must make it work well, not only for the present but for the future.

20223. But in the present state of things I suppose you consider the fact of a schoolmaster having an ordinary farm of ten or twenty acres objectionable?—I consider that persons holding farms between ten and twenty acres if they cultivate them well can live very well out of them, and pay a very good rent for them, and can be very excellent members of society. I believe that as the capital of the country increases, and as its intelligence increases, by a natural process these small farms will be consolidated; but I believe it will be a great many years before they do.

20224. I come with reference to the schoolmaster himself. It has been stated before our Commission that schoolmasters had, in certain cases, farms amounting to twenty acres, and that they were not objectionable. I want to ask whether you concur in that opinion?—I do not concur in that. I should think it very objectionable.

20225. In that case would not there be a tendency to the neglect of the school business on the part of the master?—Certainly, I should say so.

20226. I suppose in the remarks you have been making you use the statute acres?—Yes.

20227. Have you any other suggestion to make with respect to the books?—I find that our children who have gone through our National school course go to their homes with a great love for reading, we have given them the taste for literature, but we give them no food to supply that taste. I would strongly recommend that there should be lending libraries in connexion with the schools, and that the scholars who had succeeded in passing through the more advanced classes, the advanced scholars who had left the school, should have the privilege of borrowing from that library. The lending library should be in the charge of the schoolmaster, who should be allowed to use it, and the more advanced scholars and those who had left the school should be allowed to use it. I believe that otherwise we shall have created a taste which may become a dangerous taste if it be not fed with wholesome food. At present the pupils who have learned to read have literally no literature for them. They have no means of obtaining any literature except a literature that in many cases does them far more harm than good. I need not remind you lordship the nature of the story books that are often to be found in the hawkers' packs, and I need make no further allusion to much of the cheap newspaper literature of the day, than by saying that I do not think it is of a character to increase the literary knowledge of the children who may read it.

20228. You are aware that the Christian Brothers have established these lending libraries in their schools?—I am aware that they have.

20229. And that they consider it very successful?—I believe lending libraries are successful in all cases, but I would make them a part of the National system.

20230. But as many children leave school before

they arrive at the fifth class, would it not be better not to confine to the fifth class the use of the leading library?—I only mentioned the fifth class as wishing to confine it to those who would really be able to make use of the books that the leading library should supply. If it should be thought more advisable by those who are better acquainted with the subject than I am, to make it fourth and fifth class, I have no objection to that.

20231 With respect to the agricultural schools, have you any suggestions to make to the Commissioners in the way of amendment?—I have already stated to the Commissioners that I think what I may call the minor agricultural model farms a failure. I think that it would be well to get rid of them as soon as practicable under the existing laws, and I believe it would be well to get rid of the boarding system in those schools at once. Perhaps the agricultural department of the Board of Education might find some means of utilizing the schools, after getting rid of the boarding system. But the boarding system has been such a complete failure, so far as I have had an opportunity of seeing it, that I cannot recommend the devotion of State funds to keep it up.

20232 Do your remarks apply to the minor agricultural schools, or to agricultural schools in general?—When I spoke of the minor agricultural schools I did not mean small patches of land in connection with the ordinary National schools. I meant the schools which have been established in different parts of the country, which contain apartments for boarders, where there is an agricultural teacher who takes those boarders and employs their labour upon the land. I do not think that that has been of any use. I may mention to the Commissioners that I got a return the other day, unfortunately I have not it with me, but I can speak from memory. I got a return from the Mount Tremont Model School of the names of the boarders who were educated there from the commencement, and I have traced them out from the time they left the school to the present day, so I can tell you pretty accurately how far the operation of the school has been beneficial, as regards the boarders, that have been educated at it. I think, speaking from memory, the number was thirty-seven or thirty-eight. Of that number seven or eight either became farmers upon their own land, in which case they may be supposed to have derived some benefit from their agricultural teaching, or they obtained situations as land stewards and bailiffs and gamekeepers, and so on,—only seven or eight out of the whole thirty-eight. The rest have either emigrated or died, or gone into business of one sort or another, but their afterlife has not been benefited, directly at least, by the agricultural training that they got in the school.

20233 To what do you attribute the failure of the boarding system?—I attribute it partly to what I have already stated, that those schools were too large and too small. They are too small for teaching scientific agriculture. They are too enormous for teaching the ordinary farmer how to work upon his own land. What we want is this. We want a small patch of garden land, and spend husbandry, attached to the National school, on the one hand. On the other hand we want some one, two, or three great agricultural colleges. Take Glasnevin, for instance. Have another in Cork, or elsewhere, or make it one if you please. But let the system be this, and you will then have, at the one hand, really scientific instruction given to men who intend to pursue agriculture as a science, and at the other hand you will give an example to the poor which will be really useful and available to them, at the smallest cost. That is my idea. It may be right or wrong. I dare say it may be very crude, but my idea is that the agricultural training of the country should be confined to two or three great agricultural colleges, and that an example should be set before the small farmers' eyes in connection with the National school.

20234 Do you not consider that it would be very important to have the model farms corresponding to the various sorts of farms that exist at present in the country?—I do not think it would, my lord, unless you

can place them in parallel circumstances; I do not think that the instruction that you can give to a farmer on a farm of some twenty or thirty acres can be of any use, if he sees that there are appliances brought to bear upon that with which his capital cannot supply him.

20235 I suppose in those agricultural colleges that you propose, there would be different sized farms, is that right?—I should be quite willing, my lord, to consider that; and I am sure I might leave it to the discretion and judgment of the agricultural department of the Board.

20236 In the ordinary education of the schools is there any class of subjects that appears to you to be mainly developed in the ordinary teaching?—None strikes me at present, I have suggested the introduction of some historical teaching, and I have also ventured to say that I was aware that objections had been made that the teaching of history would be disapproved sometimes by persons of one religion, sometimes by persons professing another religion, on the ground that the teaching of history was one-sided and was opposed to the religious opinions of those who should make the objection. I believe that that objection can be overruled, and that there would be very little difficulty in constructing elementary historical lessons which would confine themselves to facts, and which would avoid all unessential reasoning from those facts. I have very little doubt that such lessons could be drawn up that would receive on the one hand the approbation of the Board of Education, and on the other hand the approbation of the Catholic clergy and bishops; and I believe that there would be no practical difficulty in so doing. The lessons already published in the Fifth Book prove to me that the view I have taken is correct. I find in the Fifth Book, in one of Judge Longfield's contributions, that he speaks of the assurance that has been given by the State to agriculture in this country as being opposed to the ordinary economical laws. But he says that the previous existence in Ireland of bad laws, which interfered with the prosperity and progress of the country, rendered that necessary. I find this in a book published under the authority of the Board, and this is a book that I admire, I find a historical allusion to the bad laws under which Ireland was governed. Now, in my scheme of writing history, I propose simply to record facts; I would record the penal laws, but I would not use them as a touch. I would neither on the one hand inflame the passions of the readers by dwelling upon them, nor should I on the other hand attempt to justify them. I would state them as historical facts. I would state also as historical facts, the facts that are now admitted in the recent history of Ireland, such as the sending forth of a great number of our people to found religious establishments on the Continent. I would also mention the glorious victories over the Danes, I would mention the eminences attained by many of our fellow countrymen in the service of foreign countries; I would mention the wars of the Stuarts, I would mention all those as matters of fact and I do believe, and I have that confidence in the real wish of many persons in the country to obtain and to possess historical truth, that I believe those elementary lessons could be written so as to secure the approbation of all parties. What I want, and what I believe every fair man wants, is the active absence of all false colouring in history, I care not on which side it be. There has been false colouring enough on the Protestant side, and there has been plenty of it on the Catholic side; and what I want is truth, and I believe that that truth can be had, and that such lessons can be constructed, and I believe that that instruction, if introduced into our books, would be most useful to the education of our people.

20237 Sir Robert Kane—You mentioned that in our school with which you were particularly connected, there was a large minority of Protestant children?—There was a considerable number.

20238 And in another school a smaller number?—A smaller number.

20239 What arrangement had you in that school in which the minority of Protestants was largest for carrying on religious instruction?—The usual arrangement under the orders of the Board was strictly

Dec. 1, 1866.

Stephen De Vere, esq.





I am aware of the distinction between the written and the spoken language. The written language should be preserved for antiquarian, for literary purposes; and the spoken language I should wish to have preserved throughout the country, because it is a fine language, and because I think it is a pity to lose any great or good thing.

20251. Do you think it is desirable you should have amongst the ordinary classes of any people two languages spoken?—I see no objection to it. I think it is a greater development of intellectual culture. The other day, being in the South of France, and hearing the patois spoken there, which is a kind of intelligible mixture, as the Commissioners are aware, of Italian and French, with a few words of Spanish, it struck me how much better it would be if they had separate languages and understood them all.

20252. Do you know whether anything is done under the French system in the public schools in the South of France for promoting the cultivation of the Provençal?—No; I have no knowledge at all upon the subject. In throwing out the few observations I did about the Irish language I did so with very great diffidence, and merely wishing to draw the attention of the Commissioners to the subject without presuming or attempting to dictate in what manner it was to be done.

20253. I believe I understood you as not wishing to express any opinion with regard to the question of the system of united education as a whole, or with regard to its popularity?—I think the country is very well pleased with it. I am quite willing to answer any question with regard to the popularity of it, and to its efficiency in the country. I am quite ready to answer any question, in fact, concerning the working of the present system and its effects.

20254. I should like to ask you—but I do not at all press for an answer, unless you wish to give it—whether, in your opinion, there exists any generally strong wish upon the part of the Roman Catholic population for a change from the present system of united education to a denominational system?—I think the population of the country are very grateful for the advantages they have derived from the National system. I think they feel its value, and are fully conscious of the assistance they have received, and that they are very happy to avail themselves of it in every possible way. Whether they would be more happy to avail themselves of another system if it was held before them, with all its details, administrative and financial, I cannot say. I think that they are very well pleased, very well satisfied with the present system, but that does not exclude the idea of their liking better another which might be offered to them, but which we have not before us.

20255. On the whole is it your opinion that the Roman Catholic population is at present satisfied in a reasonable degree with the nature and working of the system of the National Board?—I think they are deeply grateful for it. I think they are deeply sensible of its great advantages. I think they are perfectly satisfied with it so far as it goes, but I am not prepared to say that they would not prefer another system if it were offered to them. I am really not prepared to say whether they would or would not. I believe that opinions are very much divided on the subject.

20256. In reference to your answer to a question with regard to the circumstances of the model schools being sometimes attended by the children of persons belonging to other than the working classes, is it not the fact that in most of the ordinary middle class schools, the ordinary English education supplied in reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, and so on, is very inferior to the education that is given in a first-class National school?—I cannot speak from my own experience in that matter, but I have been informed and I believe that it is so. Would you allow me now to suggest, as you have mentioned the subject of intermediate education, an idea has sometimes struck me, by which I think that our inter-

mediate education in this country can be immensely improved. It strikes me that without interfering with the present existing intermediate schools made individual management, and without undertaking any control of them on the part of the Board of Education, the Board of Education might assist them and benefit them very much by sending down from time to time, say once a year, a committee of examiners or inspectors who should go from one part of the country to another, and who should hold in different neutral spots meetings or conferences, at which scholars selected from the different intermediate schools should attend and subject themselves for examination, that at these examinations premiums should be given to the individuals who showed most proficiency, and also to the schools from which they came. It appears to me that that would improve the character of the schools, and that it would give them life and energy and bring in mutual competition amongst the existing intermediate schools, without interfering with or without attempting a State control over them. It is possible that the funds for this scheme might be some way or other supplied out of funds which I believe are very considerable, and either unemployed or misemployed to a great extent—I mean those of the endowed schools.

20257. Do you consider that one of the social difficulties that we have in promoting the improvement of this country is owing to the want of friendly inter-communication and co-operation between the different classes of society—between the middle classes and the lower classes?—I do feel that most strongly.

20258. Is it not possible that with friendly co-operation, and mutual support and kindness might be produced by middle class persons occasionally sending their children to the model schools where they can meet and associate to a certain degree with the children of the lower classes?—Quite so. I quite agree with you, I am fully of that opinion.

20259. And that a middle class person who is himself a citizen and taxpayer has a right to avail himself, if he chooses, of the facilities for education which are supplied by the model schools, and to get the benefit of them for his children—does he not in doing so serve the State by promoting mutual good feeling and friendly understanding with the people fully to the extent to which he may benefit himself in an economical point of view, by the cheapness of the education which he gets?—To a much larger extent.

20260. On the whole, then, you do not see any disadvantage to the State or any injustice to the taxpayers from members of the middle classes occasionally availing themselves of the education given in the model schools?—Occasionally and exceptionally, so far from seeing a disadvantage, I see a very manifest advantage, not only from the census I have already attempted to enumerate, but from those which you have so strongly put.

20261. Under the ordinary conditions of society, is it likely that this class of middle class children going to primary schools would be otherwise than exceptional?—I think that they would be exceptional. I think I have already stated the grounds upon which I thought so.

20262. Is it likely that they would be more than exceptional—that such habits would become general?—No. Anything which could, directly or indirectly, tend to get rid of the miserable system of separation and exclusion which has been the curse of this country, is of inestimable value, and worth ten times more than anything we may pay for it.

20263. Mr. Gibson—Have you considered whether the appointment of paid chaplains in the several model schools at present existing, whose duty it would be to superintend the religious instruction as well of the teachers as the pupils of their respective denominations, would satisfy, to a large extent, the necessity which you mentioned with regard to non-denominational schools?—That is a question upon which I do not feel competent to give an answer. I do not know what the jurisdiction of these chaplains might be under the rules of the Church to which

Dec. 1, 1866.  
—  
Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

Dec. 1, 1896.

Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

they would belong. I would be sorry to attempt to give an answer upon anything that I do not fancy, at least, that I understand.

20274. You are aware that a principle of the model schools as originally established was, that religious instruction should be under the clergy of each religious denomination?—Yes.

20275. And that in the model school in Marlborough-street, the chaplains did attend at one time for each religious denomination on one day of the week, and gave religious instructions to the teachers and pupils of their respective denominations. But if there was a system of chaplains, the teachers and pupils would be under a more particular religious superintendence, and these chaplains would have charge of the domestic as well as the public teaching, and in that way the teachers would be under the immediate superintendence as to religious matters, and religious teaching of the clergy is, in fact, their own particular denomination, so that there would be provision made and ample security for special religious teaching, without at all interfering with the united secular teaching. Have you considered that, so far as this, that I believe that in connection with the Queen's Colleges, which we have nothing to do with now, an attempt was made to effect the same purpose through the means of ecclesiastical officers who were, I think, called Deans of Residence, and that particular difficulty of detail now which prevented the system from working fairly. I am not aware of what those difficulties were. I am only aware of the fact, that the attempt failed, and therefore, in reply to your question, I should say I might fairly assume practical difficulties would arise in the case of boarding teaching schools which were found to be inseparable in the case of the Queen's Colleges.

20276. I assume that each chaplain would be appointed by regular authority of his own Church, and paid a sufficient remuneration for the amount of time he gave, and the duties he discharged?—I would assume that if a chaplain gave religious instruction in a model school he should be paid.

20277. Would that meet the difficulty?—I am sorry to be obliged to say that, in the absence of information on the subject of what the power or jurisdiction of what three churches would be, I am unable to answer the question any way satisfactory to you.

20278. In these non-vested model schools, I presume the teachers would belong to any one denomination—the denomination of the patron?—such would probably be the case.

20279. Do you think it desirable that teachers who are to conduct a general system of united education, that they should be trained apart from teachers of another denomination—that they should not come into contact with teachers of a different denomination?—We have a choice of difficulties—we must try and do the best we can. It appears to me it is only in that system of non-vested schools we can supply ourselves with the number of teachers that the demand for teachers requires; and without going into abstract questions whether any system would be more desirable, it strikes me this is a system which would be more in harmony with the entire National system, which would transgress none of its rules, none of its regulations, and which would practically work itself out in giving the requisite number of teachers to the schools. It is upon this head, though perhaps idle, principle I have made the recommendation.

20280. You are acquainted with the process of working of the teaching establishment at Glenties?—Not at all.

20281. Are you aware that the Board of National Education at present has schools to which small portions of land are attached, and to the master of which they pay an additional sum of £5 per annum for their agricultural tending?—I am aware it has been done in some instances. I am aware of one school in the county of Clare in which it has been done, and in which a small plot of land has been given to the school-

master with practical benefit, but I am not aware of its being a general system.

20282. You think it should be extended?—Certainly. I do not know the name of the place—it is a school under the management of my brother-in-law, the Honorable Robert O'Brien, and Lord Inchiquin's estate. It is in the neighbourhood of Ennistymon, the one I refer to.

20283. In the fourteenth report, 1847, of the Commissioners of education there is this section:—

"We have published an Agricultural Class Book for the use of the advanced students attending the National schools, which it is intended shall be read by all the pupils capable of understanding its contents. The object of this little work is to explain, in as simple language as possible, the best mode of rearing a small farm, and to give, in a practical manner, the necessary knowledge in which the student should be conversant. In order to render the instruction more useful, they have been chosen, into the form of a narrative, calculated to arrest the attention of young readers. This reading book is not, however, designed as an agricultural manual for our teachers. We propose to supply this want by the publication of a series of agricultural works, rising from the simplest elementary book to the most advanced of a high character, and comprehending various branches of practical knowledge, to be used upon the subject of agricultural instruction. We circulated last year, amongst our teachers, a variety of short and useful tracts, relating to the best modes of cultivating the soil, and providing against the death of food, and we are now engaged, in circulating amongst our masters several other elementary tracts on husbandry, recently published under the direction of the Royal Agricultural Society, and containing much valuable information."

20284. In the same report they state:—

"The want of school libraries for the use of the children attending our schools has been long felt. To supply a series of instructive and interesting works adapted to the purpose, would occupy a very considerable time, and require the assistance of many individuals well qualified for compiling books suited to the wants of children. Under these circumstances, we have adopted the necessary steps for the selection of a sufficient number from those already published. Care will be taken that they are judiciously selected in all respects to the members of every national denomination. We shall buy them from the publishers at the lowest cost, and add them at reduced prices to such of the resources of our schools as may approve of their being lent to their pupils. We shall also make these regulations for rearing the school libraries were formed, which will insure a regular delivery and return of the books."

I need scarcely ask you whether that suggestion in the report of 1847 meets with approval at your hands?—Naturally. The Agricultural Class Book is excellent. I was not aware it had been made. I cordially approve of the second suggestion. I would not remind the Commission that there is a great difference between recommending a thing in a report and carrying it out in practice.

20285. Are you not aware that the National system has had the effect of diminishing very much the number of schools—of certain schools in the country—in which a mathematical and classical knowledge was given in an humble way throughout the district, that the effect, in other words, of the National system has been to shut up a great many schools throughout the country in which there was instruction given in classics and mathematics?—I have heard it said, and so far as I can judge by my own experience I cannot confirm it. My experience goes over a period of over fifty years, and the schools that have been shut up by the National schools were rather what I should call hedge schools. They were schools in which mathematics and classics were not taught. They were schools in which nothing was taught well, and they were schools that we are much better without than with. In my neighbourhood, so far as I can remember, there were none of these mathematical or classical schools to which you allude, but I should be unwilling to think that classical or mathematical knowledge was necessary for the primary education of our people.

20286. Mr. Justice Morris:—Are you in favour of the principle upon which the system of National education is founded?—I am very much in favour of the National system. Approving of the principle upon which it is founded, I beg to say that I exclude all consideration of rival systems. Supposing a different system were proposed to me in its entirety, I should then exercise my own discretion upon it, but I take

the National system as it is. I find it a good system, and I give it my hearty concurrence and support.

20287. Then I need scarcely ask you do you consider it an efficient system?—I do, very efficient.

20288. Do you think any system in the present state of Ireland, any educational system, can be efficient which will be disapproved of by the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops?—I think that will very materially lessen its efficiency.

20289. Are you aware that they are of opinion it can never be efficient?—I am not.

20290. Then do you agree in this, "That no other class a denominational system of education will ever be efficient in Ireland"?—No, I do not.

20291. Are you aware that that is the opinion of one of the Roman Catholic bishops given in this Commission?—I am not.

20292. Having heard now that it is, that in their opinion no other than a denominational system of education will ever be efficient in Ireland, do you still adhere to your opinion that the National system can be made efficient?—I do.

20293. Do you approve of the admixture of persons of different religions in schools?—I have seen it work extremely well. I beg to avoid giving any opinion upon abstract questions which I mentioned to one of the Commissioners who was good enough to examine me. I must confine myself to the duty of giving the benefit, if it be a benefit, of any experience I have acquired of the working of the National system.

20294. Are you aware it is part of our duty in this Commission to inquire into the system in Ireland, from the mode in which the system is carried out?—It may be the duty of the Commission to put certain questions and it may be the duty of a person answering to give certain answers.

20295. By the Commission under which we are sitting, that is one of the questions to be considered?—I am not aware. I have not seen the document under which the Commission is sitting.

20296. Am I to understand your evidence is merely confined to this extent, that while you regard the National system as being a satisfactory system, you are also giving your opinion as to its mode of working, but that you decline to give any opinion as to whether the National system or any other system would be better?—I decline to do so, because whether the denomination system may be a good or bad one would depend very much upon details, upon the construction of the proposed system, upon its administrative details, upon its financial details, and upon its particular bearing. If a detailed system of that kind were placed before me, I should give my attention to the subject, but if I am asked in the abstract whether I prefer the denominational or the mixed system, I say I come here to give my opinion upon existing facts and not upon the abstract question.

20297. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—May I ask you with regard to your own school, in which there was a mixture of Protestant and Catholic children, whether harmony at all times prevailed among the children of that school?—Yes.

20298. I think you have already said that you find the people generally satisfied with the National system of education?—Yes. I guarded myself in using the word satisfied by saying they were grateful for it; that they recognised its benefits, and were glad to avail themselves of it,—and saying satisfied in the sense of having come to the conclusion that it was the very best to be had under all probable circumstances.

20299. Do you find the managers of those schools equally pleased so far with the system?—Yes.

20300. I think you have said that for the most part the managers of those schools are Roman Catholic clergymen of the districts?—Yes. During the period I was manager of the late Lord Montagu's schools, I was the manager and the Roman Catholic priest was not.

20301. But with regard to the schools generally

through the county of Limerick, the Roman Catholic clergy are the managers?—I believe in a great majority of cases.

20302. With reference to the model school system you make a distinction between the vested and the non-vested system. So far as education is concerned how does that difference apply in model schools?—In the vested school all the clergy have a right to come in and teach religion, therefore the part of spiritual or religious education in the schools is in the hands of the clergy. That is not the case in non-vested schools.

20303. Then it is only in the matter of religious education the difference applies?—Only in religious education and in that degree of secular education that may be conveyed in religious instruction. There are certain books which are not books of the Board. Under the non-vested system these books might be introduced into the part of separate instruction. They might be partly religious and partly secular books.

20304. In the secular department the style of teaching is entirely the same, both in vested and non-vested schools?—I believe it is. I see no difference.

20305. And the books the same?—Yes.

20306. And the inspection the same?—Yes.

20307. Are there not in all the model schools teachers of different denominations to give religious instruction to children of the denominations to which they belong?—That is a matter of detail which I cannot speak to of my own personal knowledge.

20308. But are you aware as a matter of fact that in those schools where there are teachers of different denominations they give religious instruction, precisely as they do in the non-vested schools, to children of their own denomination?—I see a very strong distinction in the one case—in the case of non-vested schools—a religious instruction is given according to the will and under the authority of the manager of the school. In vested schools religious or spiritual instruction may be given to which the manager, the patron of the school, is no party whatsoever. In fact in vested schools the patron or manager of the school is not the head of the religious department of teaching.

20309. Have not the clergy of all denominations perfect liberty not only to superintend, but to impart religious instruction to the children of their own communion in each model school?—In vested schools, yes, and a *fortiori* in model schools.

20310. Appreciating and valuing as you do united secular education, under the National Board, and the advantages of separate religious instruction, what is your specific objection to the present model school system which affords full opportunities for both by separate rooms and a supply of teachers?—My last most important, specific objection is that it fails to supply the teachers that are required for the schools because the feeling of the country is against it, the feeling of the clergy is against it, and there is no one in fighting with the state of facts that exists, be it right or be it wrong, so it is; and I propose the substitution of a system which is in perfect harmony with the whole National school, and which will meet the practical difficulty in the case.

20311. Then it is to meet the present state of things you propose that arrangement?—I make it to meet the present state of things, and I am far from saying that the objections that are made are not founded in reason and good sense.

20312. In the non-vested training schools which you suggest, should the principle in operation in the non-vested schools be observed?—Yes.

20313. That is to say united secular and separate religious instruction?—That is what I understand by the non-vested system.

20314. In connection with this scheme proposed by you, should you take care that children of another faith from the majority should in no way be interfered with?—Certainly.

20315. It has been stated by a former witness here, that neither the clergy nor the gentry took steps to have the teachers properly remunerated. May I ask

Dec. 1, 1866.  
—  
Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

Dec. 1, 1885.  
Stephen  
De Vries, esq.

what is your experience with regard to that?—Practically I do not think they have taken steps, but that is because they think the teachers are remunerated according to a fixed system, which is not their office to interfere with. I have no doubt that if they thought they could get their teachers better remunerated by protesting against the present salaries paid by the Board, they would do so.

20314. Are you aware whether landlords are willing or otherwise to grant sites for National schools?—Landlords are a very wide term. Some landlords are, others are not. In the southern parts, generally, the landlords are, and in the southern even Protestant landlords have that liberal spirit that would make them unwilling to deny education to their Catholic neighbours, but I am informed that in the north it is not so. I am informed, though I have no knowledge of my own on the subject, that in the north practical difficulties are frequently experienced in obtaining a site for a National school.

20317. Then, should you say that the cases of landlords refusing sites are exceptional cases?—That depends upon the comparison of numbers between the one and the other. Not having any knowledge of my own on the subject I cannot answer the question.

20318. Would you think it right that the teachers trained in the non-voted model schools should be examined and classified in the general training establishment before being considered qualified to take charge of a National school?—That is not the mode that I should suggest for ascertaining their efficiency. I should rather have it done by examination than by putting them into another training establishment.

20319. Should you, however, regard it as essential that they should be examined and classified by some proper authority?—Undoubtedly.

20320. It has been proposed in view of the denominational system that there should be in each parish two sets, in some three of denominational schools, one with a Protestant manager and a Protestant teacher, and Protestant children, another with a Roman Catholic manager, Roman Catholic teacher, and Roman Catholic children, and in Presbyterian districts with a Presbyterian manager, Presbyterian teacher, and Presbyterian children, and so on. Should we take it that you are totally opposed to any such separation in the education of the youth of the country?—The question really seems to me to resolve itself into this, whether I would prefer to substitute a denominational system of education for the present National system, having already said that I wish to give no opinion on that abstract question, I hope the Commissioners will excuse me from replying to the question that has been put to me.

20321. In the districts with which you are familiar in the South of Ireland are there not many small Protestant minorities whose education under such a system must be either neglected or the children's faith endangered? Or if separate schools were set up for Protestant minorities of four, five, or six children, would not that cause as many new great pecuniary waste in the matter of building schools, keeping schools in repair, and paying teachers, &c.?—I should think this objection might be very fairly urged against the denominational system, but I am not prepared to say whether it would be valid or not.

20322. For instance, with regard to the county Limerick, the Protestants of Limerick are scattered generally over the entire county?—Yes; they are very much in colonies; they are very much in little squads; they were originally planted from the Palatine, and they have retained their distinctive character, their distinctive thought, and even their distinctive countenance to the present day.

20323. Does that statement not more immediately apply to the district of Adare? Does it apply generally to other parts of the county—towards Croome, in one direction, and towards Castleconnell in the other?—It applies generally throughout the county. In the neighbourhood of Adare there is a colony such as I have spoken of. In the neighbour-

hood of Rathkeale, upon Lough Saultwell's estate, in my own neighbourhood, there are many such. Plenty on my brother's estate; and even in the west of the county there are as much to be found.

20324. How many denominational schools under the system I have sketched just now ought to be established over the county?—I am unable to answer that question.

20325. Should you say fourteen would suffice?—I have not turned my attention at all to the substance of the denominational system that you are at present on, consequently, I must be quite unable to work out its details.

20326. It has been stated to this Commission by a gentleman who occupied, and still occupies, a position of influence and authority in this country, in answer to the question, "Supposing the case of a district where there is not a sufficient majority to maintain a school, how would you deal with it?" He says, "I believe that everywhere a school will be found for the minority, and in fact schools do exist for the majority in all parishes of Ireland at present." Do you concur in that opinion?—I have no power of concurring or denying it, I have no experience to tell me.

20327. Does your experience or information accord with his when he says, "I believe that everywhere, either the parish clergyman of the Protestant church, or some Protestant layman has a school for the Protestants in Ireland, and that no child goes to a National school because there is no Protestant school for him?"—My experience has been, as I believe I stated to the Commissioners at first, within a very narrow compass, and I certainly do not feel myself so competent to speak as the gentleman to whom you refer, and who appears to have spoken in behalf of all Ireland, I certainly won't attempt to do so.

20328. I ask you to speak of the parishes in the county of Limerick with which you are familiar?—In the parishes I am aware of I believe there are schools, in the more Roman Catholic districts there are schools in which the Protestants can get separate school instruction if they choose.

20329. In each parish of the county Limerick?—I cannot state that, but in those I am best acquainted with it is so.

20330. Do you know any parishes in which there is no such school?—There is admission for the Protestant minorities within what I should call a reasonable distance in every parish with which I am acquainted.

20331. In a school under Protestant management and Protestant teachers?—Yes.

20332. For instance, if I read to you the following statement which I have just received from the report of the Limerick Education Association, which shows that there are fourteen "Scriptural schools," as the Association calls them, in the diocese of Limerick, and besides these there are two other Scriptural schools in the county, though not in the diocese, which are attended by Protestant Catholics, and that that is the extent of school accommodation for Protestant children, should you modify your opinion?—It would not in the slightest degree modify my opinion, for I have only given my opinion with regard to what comes within my own observation. I referred in my evidence to nine schools as coming within my own immediate observation, eight of these may be said to be in one locality—they are upon one estate, the other is upon a separate estate. There is a Protestant school, a purely denominational Protestant school, within a short distance of that school that is upon one estate, and there is a school, taught by a Protestant clergyman, in the midst of the eight schools upon the other estate. I can therefore say, with respect to the nine schools, or nine school districts, that there are Protestant schools in the neighbourhood, and farther than my experience goes I am unwilling to speak.

20333. Do you know Kildimo?—Yes.

20334. That school had upon its rolls lately, in the male school, three Established Church children and ninety-five Roman Catholic children; and in the female, two Established Church children and 111 Roman

Catholic children; are you aware that there is no school under a Protestant teacher within six miles of that place?—So far from being aware of that, I am aware that it is not true.

20335. What is the nearest point?—There is a Protestant school upon my brother's estate, St. Ven de Vere, at the distance of about three miles.

20336. What is the name of the school?—It is on the lands of Drumblahan, and I think it is called Drumblahan school.

20337. Do you know Croon?—Yes.

20338. In the Croon school there is a slight mixture, a very small Protestant minority, should you be surprised to learn that the nearest Protestant school is about ten miles off?—I don't know, it is so long away from me I don't know anything about it.

20339. If you heard that within the district mapped out by the Commissioners of National Education for the districts Inspector of Lincolnton about thirty miles by twenty, there were, excluding the city schools, not more than half a dozen Protestant schools, should you modify your opinion as to the extent of school accommodation for Protestant minorities?—I have given no general opinion as to the accommodation for Protestant minorities with respect to those school circles which came within my own experience; no statistical information you could lay before me with regard to the amount of school accommodation in other localities that I am not acquainted with should make me modify the opinion I have given with regard to the facilities that I do know.

20340. Mr. Stiles.—In the case of the schools with which you were connected, who appoints the teachers?—The managers or patrons of the schools.

20341. I think you stated you were the patron of several schools?—I was. I am not now a patron of any of those schools. I have given up the management of all those schools upon the death of Lord Montagu. I gave up the management of his schools to the management of his local agent, and having ceased to reside in the neighbourhood of Kilskegan school I appointed a sub-manager, in whose hands I left it. That is the parish priest.

20342. What is the relation of a lay patron or manager towards the ecclesiastical power in reference to the appointment of teachers. There was a time when you were patron of certain schools?—Yes.

20343. As patron you appointed the teachers?—I had the power of appointing and dismissing.

20344. What was your relation then towards the parish priest in the management of the school?—Simply this, that he came in and gave religious instruction in the school. There was no other relation that I am aware of between us.

20345. In what capacity did the priest visit the school to which you appointed the teachers?—For the purpose of giving religious instruction.

20346. Did he go of right, or upon your invitation?—The school was a school vested in trustees, of which I am the surviving trustee. I believe that in that case he had a right to come in and teach, but that is a matter of detail. The officers of the Board could better answer it than I could. At any rate if he had not the right, I recognised the right, and there was never a question between us about it.

20347. Within your experience de Bonnis Catholic clergyman object to the appointment of teachers by lay patrons?—I have never known an instance of any objection of the kind. Within my experience there have been none such. I may mention that of the eight schools upon Lord Montagu's estate, of which I was manager. I was a layman, I was the manager of them, and there was always the most cordial co-operation between me and the parish priest, and I may also mention, that, at the time I was manager of the Kilskegan school, I was a Protestant, and there was no difference between me and the parish priest. That was about twenty-five or twenty-six years ago. There was never any difference between him and me, and then I was a Protestant layman.

20348. Have you ever heard of any objections being taken by the ecclesiastical authorities in such cases?—I have heard of such things.

20349. In the case of such objection, is there not something parallel in the case of a Catholic nobleman or gentleman, who holds as private property advowsons in the Established Church, but is not allowed to appoint clergymen to the benefices?—There are some points of resemblance, and there are some points of difference.

20350. Does your experience extend to schools in the North of Ireland?—Not in the least.

20351. You cannot form an opinion as to whether the National system is successful in the North of Ireland or not?—I cannot, except from the general report which I have already stated, and of the difficulty experienced in some cases of procuring sites for schools, so far as that difficulty came I think it is a most cruel deprivation of the means of instruction for the people.

20352. What evidence of approval of the National system is given by the influential classes in any part of Ireland?—I think that every resident landlord that I am aware of who knows his duty, and feels his responsibility, visits his schools, and exhibits an interest in their welfare, as has been invariably the case with every good landlord I was acquainted with. I should look upon a landlord who neglected his schools as a man who was neglecting his duty.

20353. Are such landlords common in your experience?—They are common in my county—almost universal.

20354. Would you desire to comprehend a larger number of schools within the range of Government aid?—Would you like to include the Church Education Society schools, and in short all schools of primary education?—I should like to include within the arms of the State every school that would conform to the regulations of the system, but no other.

20355. Would you say the Consolidated Fund ought to bear the whole cost of primary education in Ireland?—Not the whole cost. I think it ought to be partly supported by voluntary local contributions and school fees.

20356. I think you said on account of the history of Ireland, and the wrongs which the people suffered, there was a claim to the consideration of Government with respect to the whole cost?—I did say so, and especially upon the ground that the penal laws denied education. They made education penal. Having made education penal, they kept the people ignorant. There is a moral obligation now to restore the balance by giving education to the people.

20357. Would you propose that existing endowments for primary education should be made of more general service in conformity with the improved spirit of the age. Beneficed clergymen are too often bound by oath to keep English schools. The Incorporated Society has considerable funds for the purpose. The Erasmus Smith Board holds large grants of consecrated lands. All these endowments and others are restricted in point of religion. Would you desire to see the limitation removed by Parliament, and these large endowments made generally useful before you come upon the Consolidated Fund, to support the whole cost of the primary education of this country?—In the first place I don't propose to come upon the Consolidated Fund for the whole cost of the primary education. I only call upon the Consolidated Fund in connection with school fees and local contributions. With regard to the subsequent part of your question, I should say that, so far as whether endowments, among the revenues of the benefices in the hands of the Established Church clergymen are utilised with the supposed liability for education, I beg not to enter into that question at all. That is a most important, and a most difficult historical question. With regard to endowments for schools such as Erasmus Smith's schools and other endowments which you mention, I should most heartily rejoice to see these made available for the education of the country, but as I mentioned in answer to a question from the noble lord, the Chan-

Dec. 1, 1866

Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

Dec. 1, 1868.

Stephen  
De Vries, esq.

20350. I think I said I should wish to devote these sums to the encouragement of the intermediate education of the country for which, I believe, these endowments were originally intended.

20351. In any attempt to redress the educational wrongs of Ireland would not the first step be to make available the large funds which have been appropriated to primary education, but with a limitation which is no longer in accordance with the spirit of the age?—It would be a step but not the first step. I think the first step is to provide education for the poor. That ought to be done out of State funds and local funds. The next point ought to be the establishment of intermediate schools for the middle classes, and that I think ought to be taken out of the funds of the Erasmus Smith Board.

20352. If sites were taken as you suggest for National schools under compulsory powers, who would build the schools?—The schools, if vested schools, would be built under the authority of the Board of Education, and, as I would suggest, by an architect of their own.

20353. Would the whole cost be borne by the Board of Education?—Yes.

20354. Would the schools be repaired by the same Board?—Certainly, vested schools are always kept in repair by them I believe.

20355. Who would have the management of the schools in that case?—I would apply the same rules as are now applied to all other vested schools.

20356. Are you aware the management of vested schools is not such as to give satisfaction to the Catholic authorities?—I am not aware of that, the vested schools are so few. I have never come across any vested schools, except schools vested in trustees. When you speak of vested schools I understand you mean schools vested in the Board in its corporate capacity.

20357. Are you aware that sites of schools have been granted in former times, and that schools have been abandoned in different parts of Ireland?—I believe such to be the case.

20358. Allow me to read the following for you—

"There is a class of endowments, many of which are not at present in operation, that seems to us to deserve special consideration. I allude to the very considerable number of estates consisting of some grants of land in fee-simple, made in pursuance of estates, and devoted for ever to the purpose of education, free of rent. In a great many instances the schools have been closed, the school-houses have fallen into disrepair and ruin, and are an eye-sore to the neighbourhood. Most of these school-houses were erected in times when it was the policy of the State to promote National education, chiefly through the instrumentality of the Education Board; and building grants were made from the Lord Lieutenant's school fund, and other parliamentary funds, on condition that the proprietors should dedicate for ever an acre of land to the school. Without offering any opinion upon the original expediency of these measures, it cannot be denied that there have, in a great many instances, but the proprietors of estates into persons which they never would have assumed but for the parliamentary grants, and when the grants were withdrawn without relieving the proprietors to their original position, something like a breach of faith, or at least of an honorable understanding, seems to have been committed. In case it should ever be in contemplation to acquire and to implement the existing endowments at the hands of the Government, the class of endowments to which I allude appear to me to deserve special consideration."

That being the case in many parts of Ireland, before you proceed further to take powers of land compulsorily from the landlords for schools, would it not be well to make available the grants of land made already and conveyed in fee-simple for primary education?—I think it would, provided they were conveyed in such a way as that the education would be carried on according to the principle of the National system.

20359. Do you not anticipate, as in the United States and England, so here also, in the progress of events, primary education will fall more and more into the hands of female teachers?—I do not, as regards this country, and for this reason, that I think the intellectual development of the women of the country is going on at a much slower rate than that of the men.

20360. Is not the difficulty of securing efficient

schoolmasters for the salaries within the ability of the school managers getting greater and greater every day?—I don't think any difficulty will be found in this country, if we had non-vested training schools.

20361. Looking at the land held by ecclesiastical persons, do you consider that such land is generally well managed? I refer to glebes, and the portion of land held by priests, and so on?—I think land farmed directly by ecclesiastical persons is generally well managed. The glebes of the Established Church clergy and the little farms held by Catholic priests are generally better managed than those around. There is more capital applied to them.

20362. Do you think land held on uncertain tenure by persons who have no interest in their successors is likely to be well cultivated?—I do, when the good cultivation of the land would bring direct benefit in the shape of premiums from the Board, and the expression of the approbation of the Inspectors. I do most distinctly.

20363. But without that particular encouragement, do you think that schoolmasters holding land as part of the emoluments of an office from which they may be removed at any time without notice, would be likely to keep it in good condition?—I am very glad you asked me that question, as it enables me to supply a defect in my previous announcement of the scheme. I should perceive that the house and kitchen-garden attached to the house should be held as part of payment to the teacher, and that the moment the teacher was removed from his office he should be also removed from his house and garden, so as to keep it vacant for his successor. With regard to the bit of land to be kept as a kind of model Belgium made husbandry farms, I specifically mentioned that that should be held by direct tenure from the landlord; that the teacher should pay the rent himself, that the Board of Education should have nothing to do with it further than to inspect its progress, and see that it was used as a model for agricultural instruction in the school, and that the teacher would, of course, be entitled to the same notice to quit, and the same rights as the tenant, with regard to that bit of land, that he would if he held a farm of fifty acres elsewhere. He would stand in the relation of tenant to his landlord, subject to all the rights of a tenant with respect to that, but with respect to the house and kitchen-garden, these he would have as part of the salary of his office.

20364. In lapse of time do you not think the land would be squandered from the school under the system which you describe?—No, I think the landlord would take care it should not be so.

20365. Would you deprive the master from the privilege of letting the land, if he preferred to do so rather than work it himself?—Certainly.

20366. You would not allow him to let it?—I would not.

20367. With regard to industrial education, are you aware that probably all attempts in that direction, whether with boys or girls, in connexion with primary schools have failed?—I believe they have failed.

20368. I think you mentioned cooking—do you think it likely the qualification of a good cook and a good schoolmaster would be found combined in one individual, and even as a succession of individuals, except you set up a school to teach cooking to schoolmistresses also?—I think you might, if it were made part of the training course in the Training Establishment. We must only go a little further back.

20369. Would you contemplate two teachers—one for cooking and the other for intellectual subjects?—Certainly not. I would make the cooking teaching entirely subsidiary to ordinary teaching. I would be sorry to give it any undue importance, although it is of considerable importance.

20370. Do I understand you to recommend industrial training in schools?—I do, to a certain extent. I recommend agricultural training, and that part of it should be the training and management of the kitchen-garden, and that the management of that should be connected with the teaching of simple rules of cookery.

30378. Do you think parents desire their children to labour with their hands while at school?—Certainly not.

30379. Have you not found parents object universally to their children being put to labour unless paid for their work?—I have.

30380. Do you not think it better to confine the primary school to its proper function—namely, the cultivation of the mind and manners?—I do not. If you allow me to explain what appears a contradiction. I am sure you did not intend it, though you put it as such. I am as much opposed to you can be to the compulsory employment of the industrial class taken from the school upon the land of the teacher. But on the other hand, I am very strongly impressed with the advantages that would be derived from giving agricultural lectures and instruction, partly out of the Agricultural Class Book, and partly as exemplified by example of the kitchen garden, or to place a book of spade husbandry before them by walking them through it, and lecturing them upon it. I believe these would be a great advantage in that amount of industrial training, but I quite agree with you in deprecating the employment of actual labour of children. It would be injurious to the character of the school. Nothing would induce the parents to believe of any school but that the children were sent to school to make money for the teacher.

30381. Am I to understand your scheme goes no further than literary instruction, upon industrial matters, illustrated by material objects?—You have put it very clearly.

30382. Lord *Overstook*—With respect to this garden to be cultivated by spade labour, who is to perform that labour?—Whoever the teacher chooses to employ as his labourers.

30383. To employ labourers?—To employ labourers.

30384. Do you believe that in any part of Ireland you know that any bit of ground cultivated by spade labour, paid for, would be likely to be a paying concern?—I have no doubt of it at all.

30385. When you paid for labour?—Not the least detriment on the subject. I have had a good deal of experience of it.

30386. Up to two acres of land?—Yes.

30387. And your opinion is that that could be sustained by spade labour, paid for, and that in the market it would pay?—No doubt it would pay. I should like to see the cultivation in the growth of green crops and root crops. I should like to see the teachers keeping a cow, and feeding that cow from the produce of the little spade farms. That such a thing is possible is not a matter of conjecture, but a matter of history.

30388. Mr *Stokes*—When Mr Charles Boyton was under examination before the Lords' Committee, in '84, he was asked—"Do not you think a system of primary instruction is very preposterous which leaves children entirely ignorant of the history of their own country?" and his answer was—"As a Protestant, I think the less they know of the history of Ireland the better." Do you think that devotion to truth that I was delighted to hear you express has made so much progress since 1854 that school managers in Ireland would be likely to acquiesce in teaching the facts of history, and the facts only in primary schools?—I do. I may also say that I don't at all agree in Mr Boyton's antipathy itself.

30389. In reference to your system of what you call non-vested training schools, do you contemplate allowing any persons to provide such training schools as they please, and to conduct them as they please, and then to come on the Consolidated Fund for the entire cost of their maintenance?—I should be very sorry indeed to put any expense on the Consolidated Fund for the education of persons who are not properly educated. If the school was not carried out according to the rules of the Board, and if not carried out with a reasonable degree of success, then under the rules which apply to other

non-vested schools, I take it for granted the funds of the State would be withdrawn from it. But, supposing it to be carried out fairly, and with reasonable success, I do not conclude that the funds of the State would be misapplied—quite the contrary.

30390. Am I right in supposing that by training schools you mean a kind of double institution, consisting first of a house in which young teachers may be lodged and boarded, and made teachers, to that house, then, would be attached a primary school for children, in which young teachers would be practised in the art of teaching?—I don't think boarding or residence is an essential part of the training school. It would be very useful, and I should be prepared to feel very well disposed towards it. I don't think it an essential part. What I do mean by a non-vested training school is a non-vested school for the purpose of teaching and bringing up teachers. I believe a boarding establishment united with that, if it could be managed, would be very useful.

30391. Would the non-vested training school which you contemplate compare with the Marlborough-street school, or with one of the district model schools?—I don't know anything about the Marlborough-street school, and would rather not answer.

30392. With respect to its regulations?—I can't say what the regulations are based upon. The regulations in Marlborough-street school, or in any district or vested school would require certain modifications to adapt them to the non-vested system. I cannot compare them with institutions I am not sufficiently acquainted with.

30393. Are you aware that at the district model schools a small number of youths are trained as pupil-teachers who are lodged while undergoing that training, and after a certain course of two years, I believe they are sent up to Marlborough-street to be trained as teachers, would these new institutions resemble the model school for the pupil-teachers commencing their training, or Marlborough-street, which completes the training of the teachers?—I should say they would have some relation to the district model schools. I would like to have entirely untouched the question of their ultimate destination in Marlborough-street. I think it is all probability arrangements might be made by which their pupils might be accepted in Marlborough-street; but I really cannot answer.

30394. The schools you have in your mind would not differ very much from a good convent school, free from, perhaps, some restrictions, in which franchise masters would be trained?—I think they would have quite a different character, being looked upon as special schools for training teachers. A different class of persons would be sent there altogether. I should look upon them as a very different kind of schools from convent schools.

30395. Who would be likely to found non-vested training schools?—I should think non-vested schools to train Catholic teachers would be founded on the application of the principal Catholic clergy, perhaps the bishop and other principal clergy of the place.

30396. Do you think it likely that persons of different denominations would combine in founding a school of that class?—I don't think it at all likely.

30397. Would not in fact the non-vested training schools be denominational?—Certainly not. A denominational school must be denominational. A non-vested school is a school which may be denominational, and may not be. It is a great distinction in principle.

30398. If the Board acknowledge a non-vested training school upon the application of the leading ecclesiastics of a diocese, is it not certain that that institution will, in its working, be a distinctive Catholic institution?—Very far from it; in the practical working I would take it that a sprinkling of members of different religions would attend, provided it was a good school, it would depend on that.

30399. Who would manage such a training school after it had been taken into possession?—The managers would, as under the ordinary rules of non-vested schools, I speak here under correction. The non-

Dec. 1, 1866.  
—  
Stephen  
De Vera, 1866.

Dec. 1, 1904.  
 Stephen  
 Dr. Vere, esq.

agents would be the persons making the application for the school and obtaining the grant.

20400. In the case supposed, the leading ecclesiastics of the diocese?—Yes.

20401. Would you give the Board any right to regulate the admission of young persons to be trained?—No right that they don't possess in the case of ordinary non-vested schools.

20402. Would the right of admission be left to the managers, the ecclesiastics?—Clearly.

20403. Would the Board have any right to direct a particular course of studies?—The Board would have a right to require the use of the books published under the authority of the Board, further than that, the Board would have the power, by their subsequent examination of the pupils, to reject those who were found unfit for teaching or further training.

20404. By what means do you propose that the Board should secure that the persons trained actually take service as teachers in Irish primary schools?—To recommend to the patrons and managers of schools persons that they think fit to get as teachers in those schools, and so far as my experience goes the managers are always very ready, very thankful to accept the recommendation of the officers of the Board.

20405. If young persons were admitted to the advantages of training upon the nomination of managers, would it not be necessary to guard that power of admission against abuse, by securing that the persons trained actually become teachers of schools?—I think not, if they did not show the avowed capacity for becoming teachers, or if any other circumstances made them devote themselves to any other line of life, there is no reason why they should not enjoy the benefit of the training they received, I would not compel them to become teachers.

20406. If the training were provided for them at the public cost, do you not think the public have a right to require a return by their taking service in the schools?—I think not.

20407. Have you heard that a similar plan having been tried in England led to many abuses?—I have not.

20408. In England it was found after a while that among young men trained in the training schools at the expense of the State, many became clergymen, clerks, or entered upon other occupations than those of teachers; and we have heard that many trained in Middlemarch did not become teachers—a not that a waste of public money should be avoided by some means?—I don't think it is a waste of public money—anything that educates people, no matter what portion of life they go into, the money that has been spent in so educating them has not been wasted.

20409. Supposing non-vested training school is established as you say by the leading ecclesiastics of the diocese, would not the management of such a school be likely to be placed in the hands of "brothers" for the schoolmasters, and of men for the schoolmistresses, as the best qualified persons available for the management of works of the kind?—I should think not. I don't think it is at all necessary it should be so, and I don't think it likely it would be so, I think it is more likely they would keep the non-vested training school in their own hands, under their own management, and would not try to transfer their duties to anybody else. But I should care very little in whose hands it was put so long as it was in the hands of people who conformed to the regulations of the Board—who conformed to the rules of the system.

20410. Supposing a non-vested training school under "brothers" and men maintained wholly out of the public purse, do you think it likely the British Parliament would continue to vote money to support those institutions for any considerable length of time?—I believe there is enough of justice in the British Parliament to vote money for persons doing great public duties if they do them fairly. If those "brothers," or nuns, or anybody else did their duty fairly and efficiently I believe Parliament would justly give them the pay.

20411. Are you aware that "brothers" are now excluded by an express rule of the Board?—I am.

20412. That justice, upon which you rely, has not suffered in that particular case to relieve the "brothers"?—I believe they are excluded because they refused to conform to certain regulations of the Board; I believe they have in fact excluded themselves, and have not been excluded by any injustice on the part of others.

20413. Did you ever hear of a case in the city of Cork where the Treasury mentioned the grant of a site for a school upon condition that it was to be a National school, and yet when the "brothers" built the school the National Board refused to take it into consideration wholly and solely because the brothers were to teach it, although the brothers had two schools under the Board, and carried out the rules of the Board as faithfully as they were carried out in other schools?—I have not heard of that case, and if I had heard it I should have thought it a very unusual case.

20414. I think you gave an opinion against mixed boarding schools?—I said that in training schools with boarding schools belonging to them, I thought the non-vested system would work better for producing the requisite supply of teachers.

20415. In reference to agricultural schools, you said you objected to boarding schools?—I said the boarding agricultural schools didn't work at all; but that is entirely from other reasons. My answer referred to agricultural model schools only.

20416. Did your adverse opinion at all rest upon the difficulty, in boarding schools, of dealing with the moral and religious education of young persons differing in religion from the teachers?—My objection to boarding agricultural schools had nothing in the world to do with religious differences or difficulties of any kind or sort. My objection was this—that young men, the sons of farmers, were taken away from their fathers' houses, for one or two years, at a time of life at which their labour was very important and very valuable to the father; and the father found that after two or three years had been devoted to agricultural training, the advantages were not commensurate with this expenditure. It was upon that ground, and that ground only, I stated my disapproval of the boarding system in the minor agricultural model schools.

20417. The Chairman.—Has it not been an advantage to a small farmer to get one of his children off the land and employed afterwards?—Yes. If quite sure he had even a reasonable ground for hoping that sending him to this agricultural school would provide for him afterwards, but by the statistics I have given of one school I was acquainted with, it turned out that of thirty-seven or thirty-eight scholars educated in it only seven or eight derived any advantage in afterlife, any direct advantage from the education they had received in the model school.

20418. I thought you stated in a former answer that the remainder of those persons found occupation for themselves in commercial pursuits?—Yes, in many ways, but in ways in which they were not favoured at all by the agricultural education they had received. They would have perhaps learned more that would have been useful to them, in the meantime, at an ordinary school.

20419. Mr. Stokes.—Your objection does not lie at all against boarding pupils, but against taking them away from their homes?—That is the objection their parents make. I object to the system—not because it is a bad system, but because it has failed.

20420. Have you never heard of moral scandals and religious squabbles happening in them?—Never.

20421. To go back for a moment to the question of non-vested training schools, I think you said you would limit these schools to the use of the Board's books?—Yes, in the mixed secular instruction.

20422. Do you think it desirable that no choice in the matter of books should be given to managers of schools?—Far from it. I should give a very extensive power of selection to the managers of schools. They might select this book or that book, or any two or three books, and they might select any reading books



they pleased out of the educational series sanctioned by the Board but they should not have the power of going beyond that series.

20423. Would you desire that the Board should put forth a comprehensive list of books from which the patrons or managers of schools might choose such as they would prefer?—Yes, I think it would be very desirable.

20424. Lord Gladstone.—In the school which you have had the management of, what proportion of Protestants was there—what was the Protestant minority attending in it?—I believe very small—about one-sixth. I believe there were from five to eight Protestant boys, and the general attendance at the school varied from sixty to eighty.

20425. You said there were Protestant schools in the neighbourhood?—Within half a mile of it, or perhaps a quarter of a mile.

20426. Therefore those seven or eight Protestant children preferred coming to your school to going to the Protestant school?—Yes.

20427. It was, probably, the better school of the two?—No doubt.

20428. The teacher was a Roman Catholic you said?—Yes.

20429. You consider that it does not signify, with respect to a school, whether the teacher is a Protestant or Roman Catholic in secular education?—I should be very sorry to say that, for I do consider it to be of very great importance that where there is a great Catholic majority the teacher should be of that religion also. I found my opinion to a great degree upon the anxiety of keeping up a public opinion in favour of the school itself; for I believe that, whether rightly or wrongly I do not say, but I believe that public opinion in a locality will not run so much in favour of a school if the teacher were of a religion contrary to the religion of the great majority of the school, as if he were of the same religion as the majority, and besides that, I mentioned that part of the duty of a teacher is to teach religion under the directions of the managers.

20430. You said it was of very great importance that the teacher should be of the same religion as the majority of the school?—Yes.

20431. Does not that imply that the more important it is in favour of the majority to have a teacher of their own religion, the more it must tell against the minority to have a teacher of a different religion?—I think there may be something in that argument; but, after all, in the ordinary affairs of life I think we have to exert for minorities rather than for majorities. What we have to see is that no injustice is thereby done to the minorities.

20432. Now, to come to this long discussed method which you have propounded as to non-vested model schools. I believe you prefer, or at least approve of the present system of model schools as it exists—in fact, you only propose these non-vested schools, if I understand you aright, because the present model schools are impossible?—I don't wish to interfere with the present model schools at all, but I would improve to them a sort of school which would make the whole system work better.

20433. In fact you propose these non-vested schools because the existing model schools have not answered the purpose?—Yes, they are not doing their work.

20434. Do you think the non-vested schools you propose would do away with the objections you see to the present model schools?—I think they would be free from the objections that at present exist to the model schools.

20435. Do you think the schools you propose would obviate the allegations which exist to the model schools?—I think you will hear of very little objection to the existing model schools if there were non-vested schools too. At any rate, if such objections are urged, they will lose a great deal of their weight.

20436. The objection manifestly is that it is preferred the two religions should not be educated together. Is not that so?—No; I entirely differ from

that opinion. The two religions are educated together in the ordinary National schools, and these are carried on with the entire consent and approbation of the Roman Catholic clergy and the country.

20437. But is not one of the allegations, in fact the main objection, on the part of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities to the existing model schools that the two classes—Roman Catholics and Protestants—are educated together?—The objection is that, that they are educated together in the training schools. I should rather object to the way in which you have put it. The objection is not that the two are educated together, but that the education of the Catholic teacher is not placed in the hands of Catholic managers. That is the objection; but I, at the same time, think they would not in the slightest degree object to these non-vested training schools being employed for the purposes of mixed education if Protestants chose to come to them.

20438. If they could instruct Protestants in Roman Catholic doctrines they would have no objection?—I beg your pardon, I must deny that altogether. That would be so directly in contravention of the rules of the Board that they could not have the folly to propose such a scheme.

20439. You think they have sufficient control over their own people to take away those objections and they would adhere to a system founded on that plan?—I am perfectly aware such is the case, and I have the most perfect confidence and I know that in a case directly in point, which is the management of the convent schools. I know that the nuns who manage them make it almost I may say a case of conscience to strictly adhere to the rules of the Board under which they get their grants. I believe it would be so in those non-vested training schools.

20440. You said also you would give power to the Board to take sites for schools wherever necessary?—Yes.

20441. Are you aware what the objections are very often on the part of landlords to giving sites for schools?—I believe that the objection is that they don't wish to have a school on their property in which the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion would be taught.

20442. Don't you think it fair that if a landlord establishes a school upon his property he should have a claim and a voice in the management of that school, always assuming of course he had not the slightest idea of interfering with the religious opinions of the children?—Not necessarily if he did not do the duties of manager. The office of manager is not a mere office of honour; the duties are very important, very responsible. I believe if a landlord is not prepared to do the duties of a manager he ought not to be appointed, and ought not seek the position.

20443. But suppose judgment goes against him before he is tried at all, and that he is precluded by the authorities who have the power of opposing him, that the children are not to be allowed to go to the school in which he has any sort of control?—I suppose the case to which you wish to direct my attention is that of a Protestant landlord in the north of Ireland who refuses a site for a National school upon his property unless he himself is to be the manager of the school.

20444. No; I go further than that. I wish to put before you a case in which a landlord not only offered a site, but offered to build the school, and asked the contractors at least of the priest to help him in establishing it, and declined to have anything to do with the education of the school, which he was prepared to leave entirely to the National school Inspector, assisted, he hoped, by the Roman Catholic clergyman; and yet he was told that it was perfectly inadmissible, unless the school was handed over to the bishop and priest together. Is that your idea of the way in which a landlord should be encouraged to give sites, or assist in education?—I would be very sorry to generalize from a particular case. I should say that if a Protestant landlord offered to give a site for a school, and to

Dec. 1, 1866.  
—  
Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

Dec. 1, 1868.

Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

himself not to interfere with the religious education of the children—supposing them to be principally Roman Catholics—and agree to give them a Catholic teacher, I should think it might be very unreasonable indeed to refuse his offer, but I should be very sorry to generalize from such an instance.

20445. I shall just read you one paragraph from the answer of the Roman Catholic bishop to the application made for his assistance and co-operation in a scheme of that sort. I won't read the whole letter. It is rather long, but I will read one paragraph—"The selection of school teachers for Catholic children cannot belong to non-Catholics, and if made and enforced by them, it is a violation of the rights of Catholic parents and of the Catholic clergy, and is really a most dangerous form of religious persecution; and if such selection is made in of right, and enforced by landlords, even Catholics, it is an abuse of power, and oppressive alike to the tenants and the clergy." Do you think that that is the sort of answer which a Protestant landlord who offers to put a school upon his estate, and merely claims to be a patron, and have the power of appointing the best Roman Catholic teacher he can find, and of rejecting him if he should see reason for it—that being the only power he claims—do you think that such an offer should be termed "a most dangerous form of religious persecution," and be rejected?—I think the offer was rightly rejected if there was any reason to feel any doubt as to the manner in which that Protestant landlord would carry out his obligations regarding the management of the school. If there was every reason to believe that he would honestly and fairly appoint a teacher suitable to the population to be taught, and that he would not in any way interfere with them, I don't think that answer would have been given, or ought to have been given.

20446. Shall I read you a passage from the application made to the bishop to which the answer was given, from which I have read you a passage—

"Last year I was anxious to build a school, but before doing so, as the population is Roman Catholic, I felt it right to consult the Roman Catholic clergyman and request his co-operation and assistance in carrying on school business. I stated that I wished the school to be placed under the Board of National Education, that it was not my intention to interfere with the education of the children, which I should consent to a Roman Catholic master, superintended by the National Board Inspector, and, as I heard, visited by the Roman Catholic clergyman. But I refused to be patron of a school built by myself on my own property, and to have the exclusive right of appointing and dismissing the schoolmaster. I added, that as I was most anxious for the Roman Catholic clergyman's co-operation, and co-operation, I should be pleased very much by his opinion, it being far from my wish to trample the sacredness of a schoolmaster of whom, with respect to faith and morals, he might have reason to suppose."

Is that a liberal offer for a Protestant landlord to have made?—It may and it may not. A good deal depends upon the character of the landlord. I may observe that as against your instance not coming within my own knowledge, I place the instances of the nine schools which all came within my own knowledge, and in every one of which the grant was made upon the application of Protestant landlords and was accepted by the Catholic clergy without any stipulation whatsoever as to the teaching, and simply from a well-grounded confidence in the benevolent intention of the landlord long generously aided.

20447. How long is that ago?—Those schools were founded at different periods, some earlier and some later, but the same remark applies to them all, and there are some instances against your one.

20448. You also proposed that attached to each of the schools there should be a portion of land for a kitchen garden, and I think you said that this was to be a matter between the landlord or the proprietor of the ground and the schoolmaster?—With regard to the small husbandry farms, and that is what I suggested.

20449. I want to know, then, if the schoolmaster offered, or did anything to offend the manager of his school, and was therefore dismissed, how would the landlord and the schoolmaster settle their differences about the land?—If the parties turned away the master, then the master loses his house and garden.

20450. If he was a tenant to the proprietor of the soil then he could not be turned out as quickly as the manager would turn him out of the school?—Pardon me, no one knows better than yourself, my lord, that if you have a gamekeeper or a gate-keeper, or a steward, or any such class of person, who holds a house and garden as a part of his official payment for doing his duties, and if you dismiss that man from his office, you also at the same time dismiss him from his house and garden.

20451. Clearly so, if it is as part of his payment that he holds them, but I understood you to state that the management about the land should be left between the landlord and the schoolmaster?—I drew a distinction between the house and garden, which he had as part of his salary, and what I may term the little Belgian farms of two or three acres, which was to be matter of agreement with the landlord. With respect to that portion of land he would be entitled to refuse to quit from the landlord, and justly, otherwise he would not be able to get the benefit of crops he had sown in the ground.

20452. Would not that then have the effect of separating the farm from the school in the event of the master's dismissal?—During the time the notice to quit was running it would. There is one little anecdote which I can hardly deny myself the pleasure of mentioning, if permitted, for it shows in the particular school to which it refers, the Kilmarnock school, the enormous benefit that society, as well as the children themselves, receive. It was in the year 1846, the year of the relief works, and I was asked to become Engineer to the bureau in which I was living for the purpose of conducting the relief works during that winter. I found that in all the neighbouring baronies the great difficulty experienced was the procuring of honest officers; they were not to be had. They were enormously paid, and they were bad and very dishonest. I tried an experiment in my locality. I went to my own school, and I went to the top class in it—the Fifth—where there were boys of sixteen and seventeen, and some over eighteen, and I appointed them to these offices, at two-thirds the salaries paid elsewhere to the ordinary clerk clerks, and said to them I would raise their salaries if they did their work well. I employed these boys through the whole of that winter, and I venture to say that there was no barony in Ireland in which so good value was given to the public, and during the whole of the time I never had a single instance of misconduct or delinquency among the boys of that school who acted in that capacity under me.

20453. Rev. Dr. Falson—Do you think in view of an offer so liberal as mentioned by Lord Clonbrock in a district requiring greater school accommodation, the Roman Catholic bishop is justified in refusing such, thereby depriving the children in that district of the benefits of a good education?—I am very sorry to say that I don't think myself justified in becoming the censor upon the action of other persons. In this matter he may have been right or wrong, but I shall not venture to pronounce any opinion upon his conduct.

20454. But do you think a bishop justified in interfering the children's attendance at such a school, and so depriving them of the benefit of secondary education?—On the same ground I must decline to answer that question.

20455. Is it your opinion that Protestant landlords in order to get the children of their tenantry, irrespective of religious denominations, educated, should be called upon to hand over part of their property to the bishops and clergy of any Church, and thereby deprive themselves of all personal connection with or control over the education of the country?—It is my opinion that it is the duty of persons exercising that great trust which is confided to them as landlords, to do every thing that can be done to promote the education of their tenantry and of the people about them, if doing that places out of their own hands any exclusive power of education which they might wish to possess, that is

no reason why they are to neglect the duty of using the people properly educated.

20450. And place that exclusive power in hands foreign to their own?—They do not place the exclusive power in the hands of the managers of the schools; they place in the hands of the managers of the schools a power of carrying on the education according to the rules of the National system; that is not an exclusive power.

20451. Is it not exclusive to be as the landlords are concerned?—If the landlord gives the management of the school to another, of course he excludes himself thereby from the management of that school; but he does not exclude himself thereby from participating in the education of the country.

20452. Mr. Stiles—In framing the constitution of a school which is designed to be a permanent institution, would not the Roman Catholic bishop be justified in looking not only to the present school landlord, but to the changes which the course of time might bring about when the land would pass into different hands, and perhaps the school experience very different treatment?—No doubt the Catholic bishop, or anyone connected with the education of the country, would be not only justified but bound to look forward to every possible contingency; I say no more than that.

20453. Lord Clarendon—Even under these circumstances would not the bishop always have the power in his hands of withdrawing the children if there was any abuse?—Yes, no doubt.

20454. The Chancellor—Have you had much experience as to undue delay either in instances of building new or enlarging existing vested schools?—Yes, I have had some; I have heard, too, very great complaints on the subject. There are great delays on the part of the Board of Education, even when they agree to enlarge or build a school—great delays, but I do not believe they are so much attributable to the Board of Education as they are caused by the Board of Works.

20455. Do these delays often arise from a delay in supplying the Board of Works with a complete title of conveyance?—I think not, because in the cases that have come more clearly within my own observation no question of title was concerned; it was merely the case of an additional school-room.

20456. What is the name of the school to which you refer?—Kilcorra, county of Limerick.

20457. When was the application for the enlargement made?—I think the last application was made between two or three years ago, perhaps three years ago.

20458. Is it still outstanding?—It is still outstanding.

20459. Is there any question of obtaining additional land for this?—Not at all, there is plenty of land.

20460. Have the plans for the addition been approved by the Board of Education?—I do not think they have ever been finally approved, but no difficulty has arisen about it. The persons applying for the increase were ready to adopt any plan the Board would order.

20461. Have the plans been approved by the Board of Works?—I cannot state where the delay has arisen, but I am inclined to believe it has arisen with the Board of Works. I am myself aware that in cases of the repairs of vested schools very considerable delays occur, and that these delays involve great waste. A few slates may be wanted, or a few windows may be wanted, and the non-repair of these things increase the expense, and that in consequence of the delays.

20462. I think there was a plan to put an architect in connection with the Board of Education to do these duties, and to separate them altogether from the Board of Works. Was not the original plan departed from some years ago?—I am not aware of that. If so it was a mistake.

20463. It has been stated to us by an officer of the Board of Works that the district surveyor has power on his own authority to order trivial repairs, if he was informed they were required, or in his tour through the country, he saw they are required. In the case

you mention, do you imagine an application made to the district surveyor would do it?—I was not aware that there was that power in the district surveyor.

20470. Do you think that in the case of Kilcorra to which you refer no difficulty has arisen as to procuring the necessary money?—I am sure there has been none whatever.

20471. Do you consider that the schools under the National Board throughout the country have succeeded in avoiding imputations of proselytism?—So far as I have had direct experience of them there has been no imputations of proselytism ever thrown out, but I am perfectly aware that imputations of proselytism have been thrown out and very generally believed with regard to schools in the North of Ireland, which I am not acquainted with personally.

20472. Do you consider that at the present time confidence in the National system is increasing or diminishing?—Very much increasing, and very deservedly increasing. Several cases have occurred from time to time to create a considerable amount of distrust. The system was first of all established on the principles laid down in Lord Derby's letter, and one of the principles laid down in that was the right of the clergy of every denomination to go in and teach in all schools. That was in the year 1832. Well, then, I think it was in the year '40 the change which separated the case of the non-vested from the vested schools with regard to the right of the clergy to go in and teach occurred. That was one of the first causes that shook confidence. I think it did so wrongly and unjustly, because I think that regulation is an essential and right part of any non-vested system; but so it was, that it did create a certain amount of distrust. Well then after that came the controversy upon the meaning of the rules, which went by the name of the Stepford controversy. There was a decision on the part of the Board which again excited a great deal of distrust in the Catholic portion of the community. Then there was an attempt on the part of the Board to force upon the secular period of instruction the use of certain religious books, Scriptures Extracts, and Sacred Poetry, and Christian Evidence, and a few books of that sort which were composed by the late Dr. Whately. That was another cause of distrust. Then came the resignation of Dr. Whately. Dr. Whately resigned his seat in the Board, because he was not allowed to carry these books into the secular or forced united instruction of the schools. That again created distrust, because it showed he placed an undue importance upon these books. Then last of all came the publication of Dr. Whately's life. There is no person had a greater respect for Dr. Whately's talents, and I may say for his character, than I had, but I must say that the revelations that have appeared with regard to his conduct on the Board of Education, and his feelings, his objects, and his intentions in carrying out the forcing of his religious books on the secular instruction, forced, I think, a well grounded cause of distrust and dissatisfaction. I felt it strongly myself indeed at the time. Thus I have attempted to give, as shortly as I can, what were the causes of distrust. Almost all these have been removed, and the true interpretation has been put on the Stepford clause. The religious books have been relegated to the period of religious instruction, and the constitution of the Board itself has been remodelled, and in answer to your lordship's question, I would say the result is that the confidence, so far as I am able to form an opinion, the confidence in the fairness of the Board, and the whole system of education is increasing every day.

20473. Are you satisfied with the constitution of the Board as it stands at present?—Yes, I am perfectly satisfied with it, and should be very sorry to see it changed.

20474. Do you think that having a number of gentlemen from different parts of the country acting as channels of local information is desirable?—I think it is of the very greatest importance. I think that we cannot ever work a system well in this country that does not possess the confidence of the people, and I do

Dec. 1, 1868

Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

\* See Appendix, No. XIII.

Dec 1, 1898

Stephen  
De Vere, Esq.

not think that if the Board of Education was placed in the hands of one or two permanent Commissioners who were the paid officers and the stipendiary officers of the State, that there would be that confidence in their honourable fair play towards all parties that would make the system of education popular or successful.

20475. Would it be easy for a Board composed of two or three permanent functionaries to avoid the risk of having their appointments made from political supporters of the Government under whom the vacancy might chance to occur?—I think as long as you have a large board selected all over the country, an unpaid Board, that there is very little danger of Government jobbing. I think if you had a paid Board, and a very narrow one, holding permanent situations, there would be a very considerable danger of Government jobbing, and I think, moreover, that there would be that amount of unelastic State control in the whole system which would work very badly, and deprive it of all personal confidence.

20476. Do you think it would be desirable that changes or alterations in any of the rules and regulations of the Board should be submitted to the Lord Lieutenant for approval or be communicated to Parliament before they were carried into effect?—If there was any necessity at all for applying to a higher power I would wish that they were submitted to Parliament. I think that taking them from the Board of Education to submit them to the Lord Lieutenant is a mere formality, and that it confers no real benefit. If any rule appeared to be changed, and that there should be an appeal, let it be to Parliament.

20477. Do you think if any changes in the rules led to be approved by the Lord Lieutenant in Council that it would not invest the Government with much responsibility that it would have to go into the merits of the rules proposed?—I think that if the Lord Lieutenant was really to act as a Court of Appeal in the case, that he ought to go into the case—that he ought to investigate it, and that he would be very ill competent to investigate it, and decide justly on it, to sit in judgment upon the Board of Education whose decision he was to give judgment on. I would rather not leave the decision to the judgment of any Lord Lieutenant.

20478. In England you are aware that changes in the regulations are now laid before the Houses of Parliament at certain times. Do you think it would be desirable to extend that practice to Ireland?—All fundamental changes undoubtedly. Of course the changes your lordship alludes to are fundamental, but incidental questions—the composition of the new books, the revising of any old book—all these may be held to be, in some respects, changes, and yet I would not think it necessary to lay them before Parliament. There are certain functions performed at the headquarters of education that I would be perfectly satisfied to leave to them as at present constituted, without any higher Court of Appeal.

20479. Do you think that the delays in building and enlarging schools, of which you have spoken, arise from anything connected with education, or do you consider it to be part of a general complaint against the Board of Works for slowness in its operations?—I think it is a slowness; it was like and takes, I think that it was technical difficulties, delays in other, which might have been got rid of by a little energy, and a little anxiety to get on.

20480. Do you consider, so far as your experience goes, that more delays take place in repairing school buildings, than in repairing other buildings under the charge of the Board of Works?—I think the Board of Works are dilatory in all their works, for sometimes it appears to me it is not the Board of Works, but the Board of doing no work.

20481. If the State, from principles of economy, prefers the repairs to be executed by the Board of Works to permitting special officers of the National Board of Education to do so, do you think that those interested in schools may fairly ask that the processes should be made as simple and as rapid as possible?—Certainly.

20482. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You have said that a change took place which shook the confidence of certain parties in 1840. What was that change?—If I am not wrong as to my date, the change to which I refer is the repeal of the permission that was given to the ministers of all religions to come in as a matter of right, and teach in non-vested schools.

20483. Will you show me when that repeal took place?—I cannot tell you, I cannot refer to the reports of the National Board, but I have no doubt it will be found in the reports.

20484. Can you show me where I shall find the permission?—The permission was included in the original conditions of the schools under Lord Derby's letter, which undoubtedly did contemplate the right of ministers of religion to come into all schools in the connexion of the Board—to come into all schools and teach religion.

20485. Vested and non-vested?—Vested and non-vested.

20486. May I ask when the distinction between vested and non-vested schools took place, in your opinion?—I cannot tell you the date at which the non-vested schools were first established, but, if I am rightly informed, when non-vested schools were first established, the alteration with regard to the right of the clergy to come in and teach was not made—that it was not until some period after the establishment of the non-vested schools.

20487. May I ask where you have got the information, if not from the records of the Commissioners of Education?—I have got it from a friend who has said to me, speaking of the matter, that it was in 1840 this took place.

20488. Are you aware that Bishop Doyle, in 1834, anxious to identify himself and the parochial schools of his diocese with the National Board of Education, addressed his own priests and said they could not write in making a combined application with others, owing to the existence of their parochial schools?—I am not aware of it at all. The only passage I met with in Dr. Doyle's writings on the subject is one in which he expresses himself very strongly in favour of united education.

20489. Perhaps your attention has not been turned to this point, that in December, 1834, Dr. Doyle addressed a circular letter to the clergy of his diocese in which he says—

"Some years past it would have been easy to combine education and have only one school-house in place of two, not as at present, and thus save an effect that union which has hitherto been prevented at great sacrifice and at great expense. I venture then, that you may be excited in your application or reply to the Commissioners to point out the loss and very sufficient reason why, in these dioceses, to well supplied with school houses, few resources for aid in small schools can as yet be made in that great number by Catholics and Protestant clergymen which the Commissioners so justly recommend."

20490. Should you regard these schools built by the clergy and their funds as the beginning of the non-vested system?—Not necessarily. The application may have been that they should be taken as vested schools, and made over to the Commissioners, or the application may have been that they should be taken under the wing, as it were, of the Board of Education, and the property in them, and the responsibility left to the local clergy.

20491. In that case would the schools have been vested or non-vested?—They would be non-vested if the management of them, if the responsibility and the property in them were retained by the parochial clergy. They would have been vested if they made them over to the Commissioners.

20492. Are you aware, as a fact, that in the diocese to which Dr. Doyle refers, the schools were from the first non-vested?—I am not aware of the facts.

20493. If you licensed on the authority of the representative of the Board of Works examined before the Commissioners that in one of these counties in which the schools by there was only one vested school, and in the other county no vested school, would you regard the schools in the diocese of Bishop Doyle as non-vested schools?—I would think they were.

Dec 1, 1888  
—  
Stephen  
De Vere, esq.

20494. Should you not say the existence of such schools under the Roman Catholic clergy, the existence of such schools under the Episcopal clergy, the existence of such schools under the Presbyterian clergy, as an outstanding fact, was the beginning of the non-vested system?—Yes, certainly; I should regard the creation of a certain number of non-vested schools as the commencement of the non-vested system.

20495. Are you aware that it seems to have been the original intention of the Government of the day that all the schools should be built by public money and belong to the State?—I believe it was the intention.

20496. And that in the first year they estimated for 20 model schools, in the second for 500 primary schools, in the third year for 1,600, in the fourth for 1,000 primary schools, and so on, and the Commissioners of National Education were charged to send from that position owing to what fact should you say?—Owing to the fact that the feelings of the country were in favour of the non-vested system in which they kept the power of vesting in their own hands, and did not hand over the schools permanently and entirely to State control.

20497. Should you say so much to the feelings of the country as to the fact that the country had already sent a large number of those schools?—I should say to the feelings of the country.

20498. Now, can you state the distinction between the vested and non-vested schools?—I should think that an office of the Board accustomed to these things or technicalities could do it better, but I have no objection to give you my idea of it. My idea of a vested school is a school which is either vested in the Commissioners for their corporate capacity, or vested in trustees upon certain trusts. That the consequence of being so vested is, that every clergyman of every denomination has the power to come into that school as certain fixed hours and give denominational education in religion to his own flock.

20499. To such schools what aid is given by the Commissioners of National Education?—They give salary; they build the school; they give building ground for the school, and they give books.

20500. Would you describe a non-vested school. In other words, what grant is made by the Commissioners of National Education to a non-vested school?—I believe that to a non-vested school no grant is made for building.

20501. Then for what purpose?—A grant is made for salary, and a grant is made for books, and a grant is made for premiums to teachers.

20502. Is there any portion of the school furniture given?—I believe there is. [The room was closed, and on re-admission the examination was resumed as follows].—

20503. The Chairman.—You have stated the distinction between vested and non-vested schools in one of your answers. Are you familiar with the query often asked for each of these classes?—No, not at all.

20504. Mr. Stowe.—You are not prepared to say, Mr. De Vere, are you, at what time the distinction between vested and non-vested schools was first made known to the public?—No. I know very little about the history of the proceedings of the Board.

20505. Therefore, any evidence you have given on the matter must be regarded as rather put into your mouth than coming from any knowledge you yourself have?—As to dates, certainly. I have no personal knowledge on the matter.

20506. With regard to the vested school of which you were manager, what was done with the minority at the time the religious instruction was given to the majority?—They used to go out and play.

20507. Do you think it would be a good thing to require, in cases of mixed schools, a second room for the benefit of the minority?—I consider that it would be a very great advantage.

20508. Mr. Stowe.—Supposing a school consisting of only one room—a non-vested school—would not the difficulty be avoided, in a mixed school, if religious instruction were given only on Saturdays, and that day

only to those children who were permitted to receive religious instruction, come to the school, and the others stayed away?—I don't think that would answer. In the first place, I should be as anxious as anybody that the instruction should be given as much as possible by the clergyman himself. Now, his professional duties may not enable him to call on Saturday, and, I think, if you were to restrict the religious instruction in the school to Saturdays only, the practical result would be that for weeks together you would have none at all.

20509. But on the day the clergyman came the other children could stay at home. Would not that do?—I think the better plan would be that there should be a certain fixed time each day, when religious instruction should be given. The clergyman knows that, and he may come and instruct. If he doesn't instruct himself, he deputes the teacher or anybody else he wishes to teach for him, and in that way the religious instruction could be always given, but I think if you were to confine it to one day in the week you would have none.

20510. Wouldn't he teach on that day in the week as well as other days in the week?—He might, but he might be kept away accidentally on that day of the week. I would wish a certain amount of religious instruction given by the authorized teachers of the children to be part of the general instruction every day. I am an advocate for a purely secular system. What I want is a secular system of combined instruction, with a separate system of religious instruction, both blended together as part of the system.

20511. You are aware that under Lord Stanley's letter religious instruction must be given on one day in the week, or portion of one day?—I am aware of that.

20512. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In case of a non-vested school, should you not think the present arrangement of leaving it in the hands of the manager a very good arrangement?—I think it is. I think it works very well.

20513. The Chairman.—Is it the custom in Ireland for the clergy of the minority to call at the school of another persuasion to give religious instruction?—Do you mean the Protestant minority?

20514. Or Roman Catholic—either way?—I don't know anything about a Protestant school with a Roman Catholic minority, but with regard to schools in which the majority are Catholics, I never knew of a Protestant clergyman coming in to teach. I never saw a case of it.

20515. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you think the manager would be disposed to give the opportunity to the Protestant minister to come and give religious instruction to the Protestant minority?—I would in the case of a vested school; he is bound to do that.

20516. In case of non-vested schools?—In non-vested schools in a great many cases he would object to have religious instruction of a different sort from his own being given in the school.

20517. The Chairman.—Have you known of that right being exercised by a Protestant clergyman in a Roman Catholic vested school?—Never.

20518. Have you known of that right being exercised by a Roman Catholic clergyman in a Protestant vested school?—I have no knowledge of any Protestant vested school.

20519. Mr. Stowe.—If there was a system of reciprocity, by which ministers might be taught by their respective pastors in the North and South of Ireland, do you think the objection would be likely to come in the first instance from the Catholic side?—I think the objection would be made by both sides, but I think a great deal of the objection would be taken away by having a separate room, as you suggest.

20520. Do you think the Board would be justified in insisting upon a condition of that sort?—I think it would be very reasonable on the part of the Board to require an additional room. I should even say if there was only religious instruction to one class that it would be better there should be a separate room for giving it.

[Adjourned.]

FIFTY-THIRD DAY—DUBLIN, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1863.

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNLAVEN, K.E.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACKAY.  
The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MORRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, P.R.S.

WILLIAM BROOKER, Esq., M.C.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DRAKE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASHMYTH, STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM R. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } Secretary.  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq., }

The Lord Bishop of CORK, DUBLIN, and CARRIGROH.

Dec. 2, 1863.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Cork.

20521 The Chairman.—I believe your lordship has for many years taken a great interest in the Church Education Society and an active part in the conduct of its business?—Well, I can hardly say the latter; I have taken a lively interest in the society from the first, I was, I think, one of the first engaged in the formation of the society. I have taken a lively interest in the society, but I have not taken an active part in the conduct of its business. It has not been in my way.

20522 In the early years of the society a very considerable number of Roman Catholics went, I believe, educated in its schools?—There were in the returns not only a much larger number, but I believe a much larger proportion than at present exists or than has lately existed.

20523 Has that distinction arisen from the gradual increase of National schools or from the Roman Catholics entertaining a less favourable opinion of the society than they had originally?—Well, my lord, that is a question that I really could not answer. It refers to motives of other people, and the causes which have given rise to those motives of which I do not feel disposed to speak. There may be a combination of the causes which you have mentioned. There may be some other causes for aught I know, but I wish only to speak of the fact. I ought to add, however, that it certainly has not arisen from any change either in the principles or the rules of the society; for no such change has taken place.

20524 Are the rules of the disunion branches of the society the same as those of the parent society?—I believe in some instances there has been some diversity. That is to say, I believe under the local circumstances of some disunion societies there was for a time some relaxation with respect to the religion of the members. There was, I believe, no other material difference, at least no material difference was ever brought before me.

20525 What do you consider the fundamental principle of the Church Education Society as to its teaching?—The fundamental principle, I think, is derived from the object of the society, as expressed in the second general rule, which is:

"The objects of the Society are, to assist Schools at present existing in the country, and to establish new Schools on an improved system, for the purpose of affording to the children of the Church instruction in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Catechism and other formularies of the Church, under the direction of the Bishops and Parochial Clergy, and under the tuition of Teachers who are members of the United Church of England and Ireland."

It may have been made somewhat more distinct in the progress of controversy, arising out of particular circumstances, that brought forth explanations of it, but I think that from the first the fundamental principle was clearly this: that the schools should provide a good Scriptural education and a good Church education for children of the members of the Church. And in Rule 3 it was expressly stated that the instruction in Scripture was to be given daily to all children in attendance who were capable of reading. But from a

desire to extend its benefits to those of other communions, the schools were thrown open to all, and a relaxation of the rule with respect to religious education, was made for the purpose of rendering the schools available to others besides Church children. Perhaps I had better state that the relaxation went so far as that, that the children of those who were not members of the Church were not required to take any part in the instruction that was given in the formularies of the Church, but they fell under the general rule that all children in attendance should be daily instructed in the Scriptures.

20526 Is that requirement that all the children in daily attendance should be instructed in Scripture the point which has hindered the society from coming under the operation of the National Board?—Certainly, I should say—I ought, however, to say that there is something in addition to that which did not at first appear, because as the controversy went on it appeared that by the rules of the National Board not only was such daily instruction in the Scriptures prohibited, except under particular circumstances, but that it was also forbidden that there should be, in the hours of general instruction, any reference to Scripture, any quotation of Scripture, and finally that the Scriptures should not appear or be seen in the school during those hours. That, however, was only in addition to the ground of separation between us, but it was a very important one.

20527 Has the fundamental principle of the society with regard to religious instruction been modified at any time?—Not to my knowledge. You will observe that everything I say is from rather a remote recollection of all things connected with the controversy, as there has ceased to be a practical controversy for some time, I have not made the subject. But I do not know of any modification, or believe that there has been any.

20528 I presume your lordship is aware of the pertinacity with which the Committee of Council in England have stipulated for the maintenance of the communion clause in all small schools?—I really do not know that I can say that I am. I am, of course, aware of the introduction of the clause, and I am aware that there has been a great deal of controversy about it. But how it is carried out in practice, I really do not exactly know.

20529 Is your lordship aware from the reports of discussions in Parliament of the importance which, of late years, the House of Commons has attached to its maintenance?—I have a general impression that the House of Commons has attached importance to it; but to what extent I do not know.

20530 Does your lordship entertain any expectation that Parliament would ever be induced to relax the principle of protection of minorities which the communion clause is one method of carrying out, in favour of the existing Scriptural rule of the Church Education Society?—Really what we have to complain of is that protection has not been extended to us who are the minority. But with respect to a relaxation, by the authority of Parliament, of the rule by which

Dec. 2, 1866.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Corky.

the Church Education Society is excluded from the benefits of what is called the National system in Ireland, I do not entertain any expectation, unless under some very great change in the House of Commons, that anything of the kind can take place. At the same time if such a relaxation were recommended by such a Commission as has been appointed and is sitting now to consider the question, I do not believe then that it would be a hopeless thing that it should be adopted, particularly if it were found that it would operate to make the National system more extensively acceptable in Ireland.

20531. On what principle does the society require that Roman Catholic children should read the Bible in a version not acceptable to their parents?—I am not prepared to say that if that were the only objection that there was to the rule of the Church Education Society that it might not undergo a modification. There is some difference of opinion on that point, and I am not at all prepared to say how it might be decided if it became practically important to decide it. But your lordship is aware that the objection is to reading the Scriptures. I do not mean a general objection to reading the Scripture, but an objection to reading the Scriptures in the schools, as our rule requires it to be read. It is not, I think, particularly to the version.

20532. (Question repeated).—That was only part of a more general rule and principle; and if I am asked what are the grounds on which we require them to receive religious instruction, whether it is agreeable to their parents or not?—I answer that we make no such requirement. They come to our schools which are open to them, with a full knowledge—at least their parents have a full knowledge—of what will be required of them. What I should be asked to account for, I presume, in reference to the fact is, why we do not relax the rule which we have established for the benefit of our children, for the purpose of admitting Roman Catholic children who object to it. If that question is to be answered I have no hesitation in saying that it is because, though we should think it very desirable, and in its place a duty, to give the benefits of education to Roman Catholic children, we feel that it is a duty of subordinate obligation, and that the primary obligation is to give the best—that is the best religious—education that we can, to our own children; and that we could not make this relaxation (in our judgment I mean) without impairing, if not defeating, that primary object. That is the reason that we have insisted so strongly on the maintenance of our rule.

20533. Do I understand that the society consider that if they were to allow Roman Catholic children to come into their schools without reading the Bible it would impair the general management and teaching of the school?—We should have a decided objection to doing so even if the only religious education that was given in our schools was the reading of the Bible to which they objected. But we have a further objection which is this, that we claim on the part of the clergyman, or the schoolmasters as representing him, under his direction and control, not merely the right of superintending the religious instruction which is given through the Bible, but at all periods of the day and under all circumstances that may lead to it, the right of referring to the Bible, opening the Bible, and reading out of it, in confirmation of anything that he thinks it necessary to say, whether in the way of condemnation of the conduct of the scholars or in the way of commendation or approbation of any sentiment or principle that may occur in the books that they are reading; so that our religious instruction permeates the whole of our education, that is, that we claim the right that it shall, to whatever extent it may be found necessary or expedient that it should. We could not therefore admit Roman Catholics unless descriptively to receive secular education only and not religious education, because during secular education and in the course of it, they necessarily would receive religious education.

20534. Practically in the ordinary conduct of a common parish school is that reformation of religious instruction with the secular instruction often practised, or advantageously practised?—That is a difficult question to answer. With respect to the extent that it is practised I do not know, because it depends on the character of the clergyman, his confidence in the master, and the number of times he himself visits the school. The clergyman of course assumes the right to go into the school at any time, and in hearing a lesson or in listening to a lesson as heard by the schoolmaster he would claim the right of interposing, and I believe if he felt interested to be ought in the proper management of his school he would actually exercise the right of interposing wherever he saw a necessity. If there were complaints made to him of the conduct of one of the scholars he would interfere upon his conduct, and if it were right and necessary, as it very often would be, to refer to the Word of God in support of his condemnation of it, he would refer to it unhesitatingly, no matter who were by, whether Roman Catholics were intermingled amongst the Protestants or not. And that we regard as a very sacred right which we not only would not abandon, but not suffer to be impaired in the slightest degree. I should be mentioning your lordship and the Commissioners if I held out any other prospect, according to my judgment of what the feelings and principles of the clergy are.

20535. Do you consider it advantageous to the good management of the school that the clergyman should habitually interpose religious instruction at irregular intervals in the middle of periods assigned to other branches of instruction?—It depends on what the branch of instruction is, and the usefulness of the interposition in practice would depend very much on the character of the clergyman, and his ability to interpose profitably; but what we consider absolutely essential is that he should have the right to do so.

20536. Can you suggest any modification of the National system which would enable the vestigates of the Church Education Society to join it?—Well, I did publicly suggest a modification of the system, as I believe it may be so called, a good while since, which gave rise to a good deal of discussion; and it is the only modification that it occurs to me would get over the practical difficulty that exists in Ireland.

20537. Would you be good enough to state the principal points of it?—It is very simple. It is this—that the State should, through the National Board or any other body by which it administers the funds that Parliament votes for primary education in this country, give assistance to all schools in which the secular education that it approves of is given, and in which there is evidence, through its own inspection, that it has been honestly carried out. There might be various tests proposed for that. I suppose it might pay a capitation allowance for those who obtained a certain point in the scale and so forth, but those are all details. But the principle would be with me that this State aid should be given to all schools as a return for what the State only extends itself apparently to now—that is, as a return for the substantial progress in secular education, and that with respect to the rules for the religious instruction of the school, the patron should be left to devise them and carry them out.

20538. There are many places in Ireland where there is a religious minority, sometimes Protestant, sometimes Roman Catholic, too small in number to maintain an efficient school of its own, how would you meet the present requirement of the State that the rules of schools, aided by the State, should be such as to make religious instruction to participate in secular education?—Well, it is not for me to say what should be done for other denominations or what they should do for themselves. The members of the Established Church fall under the description in some parts of Ireland; being very few in number in many small and remote parishes. But I think that when it was made a specific object, sufficient contributions could be obtained to protect them from the dangers to

Dec. 2, 1863.  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
C Kerry

which they would be exposed. I should look with hope to the exertions that would be made for the purpose of meeting the evil. But I regard it as impracticable that in a large scheme, carried out under very great difficulties, as primary education in Ireland is, any plan which will meet all without these difficulties can be proposed—at least not involve some difficulties in some other direction. All that I can hope is that they can be averted or remedied in the way that I have said, for the children of the Church. With respect to others, I have very little doubt that they would find means of meeting the difficulty. But I must leave that to them and to Government.

20639. But, supposing the State to be willing to give the Church Education Society's schools money according to the results of their secular teaching, how would the Church Education Society meet the rule as to the requirement of the schools being made available for Roman Catholics, where the Roman Catholics were unable to establish schools of their own?—Well, the State must devise some means of meeting that difficulty for themselves, if the Roman Catholics continue to make the rule of the Church Education Society's schools an insuperable objection to attending them, because, neither with the view of including Roman Catholics among those who receive education from us, nor with the view of obtaining aid from the State will that rule be modified; I may venture to say so, I think, because we have been pretty severely laid upon the subject.

20640. Then am I to infer from your lordship's last answer that you cannot show us how the difference which now exists between the State and the Church Education Society can be accommodated?—If your lordship thinks that what I have said is an insuperable accommodation of the difference, as it is the only accommodation that I can propose, it of course is your judgment, whereas the inference which you draw from it, but I never meant that it should I think that it is a very practicable, and a very reasonable accommodation. A great deal has been done to render the National system more acceptable to the Roman Catholics of this country, and I cannot conceive how that should render it less so.

20641. Does your question amount to this, that assuming the Church Education Society's schools to remain on their present footing, the State should give them aid in proportion to the efficiency of their secular teaching?—I went even further than that, for I suggested that it might be in the form of a capitation allowance for those who attained a certain proficiency in the system, whatever it was, that was adopted by the State, or by its authorized organs, whatever that might be. But I at the same time stated that that was one of the details. The general principle was, that there should be aid given for secular education. I did not mean to prescribe the course of education which should be given, or the extent to which it should be given in a school to outline it to aid. Both those points were to be determined by the State itself, and should be the object of the inquiry of the State Inspectors to ascertain in every particular case that the required extent was given, and that being ascertained, a certain amount of aid should be given. The main point was that the State was not to interfere with the religious education given in the schools, not that I think—to protect myself from misapprehension—that plan the most wholesome on the best, but suggest it because it occurs to me that it is the only mode of getting over the very difficult and disadvantageous position in which education stands in this country.

20642. Would that system involve the abandonment, on the part of the State, of the present stipulation that Roman Catholics should be able to receive the secular without the religious instruction?—Most certainly it would.

20643. Would it practically be to adopt the Church Education schools on their present footing, examining them merely as to their secular teaching, and concerning itself with paying for that alone?—Exactly.

When I say that, of course I do not mean to cut the State or its educational organs off from an inquiry into the conduct of the school, or anything connected with it, which might render it a proper subject for punishment in the way of reduction of the allowance, or taking the allowance away entirely, or striking it off the list, but merely that the aid of the State should be to obtain and pay for secular education. That is, I say that this ought to be the aim of the State, not according to what I conceive to be the duties of the State, but according to what its present position is.

20644. Would that be to recognise denominational schools as regards the secular instruction they conveyed?—I do not like to adopt the word denominational, because it is used in different senses in connection with education, and in one at least of these, I should decidedly object to it. But if by denominational schools your lordship means schools in which there are scholars of only one religious denomination, the State does adopt to a very great extent, indeed, such schools, and supports them too; and the result of the plan suggested probably, in some cases, would be to confine the scholars to one religious denomination. It is very possible that that would be the result, and in that event, in carrying out the view that I ventured to throw out, would adopt denominational schools in that sense.

20645. Would your system contemplate giving exactly the same liberty to schools under Roman Catholic management, and attending them simply according to the goodness of their secular teaching?—Well, that is a point in which, as I said, I feel that I have not any direct concern. But I may say, that I suggest the plan with the full knowledge that that must be the necessary consequence of the adoption of it.

20646. That the same liberty should be given to schools under Roman Catholic management as to schools under Church Education management?—Under the management of all denominations. I am perfectly aware of inconveniences and disadvantages resulting from such a system; but it is only suggested as a plan for getting out of a great difficulty, and I have never heard of any that promises to do it so well. That is all that I wish to say in its favour.

20647. In that plan should you leave unprovided for those small societies who were unable to maintain a school of their own?—I have in answer to a former question expressed my belief that a provision would be made for such cases by those concerned. But if it were a great object with the State to get over the existing difficulties connected with primary education, and that the adoption of a plan which got over it involved the necessity of giving support to schools that in the abstract might not appear to be proper objects of State care and State reward, I think the State ought itself to make provision for them.

20648. Under your system you would not propose to make any special provision for cases where there might be two or three Protestants on the one side, or two or three Roman Catholics on the other side?—My system—it hardly deserves the name—but my suggestion would make no provision for them, but it would exclude some that might be made, whether by the State or in any other way.

20649. Are there many members holding office under the Church Education Society who now support the National schools on their property?—Not to my knowledge. There are many who support the Church Education Society, who also upon their own property support National schools. When I say many, I know several.

20650. Sir Robert Kane—I believe that, judging from the reports of the Church Education Society, its operations are not now quite so extensive as they were some years ago?—As regards the numbers educated in its schools, its operations are considerably diminished; but the number of schools is not diminished in the same proportion, and therefore its operations may be as extensive as that once.



20551. As to geographical distribution, the schools remain the same?—Pretty nearly, because the system is very much parochial. It has not altered in that respect.

20552. Has the proportion of the different denominations attending the schools varied in the course of the progressive diminution of the non-total of scholars?—I should say so. I must say, however, that I may not estimate too unfavorably to the Commission, that I am not really well acquainted with details; but I am pretty clear, I am nearly sure that the proportion of Roman Catholics has considerably diminished.

20553. Then, if I judge rightly your lordship's answer to the Chairman of the Commission, you consider the Church Education Society now as principally a machinery for the education of the children belonging to the Church of England?—It would always be the primary object of the society, as I have already stated, to provide education, such education as we could approve of, for the children of members of the Church, but we not only included the other object—the object of extending benefits of our schools to others—we showed the sincerity of our desire to bestow those benefits upon those by modifying our rules, so as to admit them to the general education of our schools (a part of which is instruction in the Scriptures), without requiring their attendance when instruction in the formulary of the Church was given.

20554. To what does your lordship attribute mainly the great diminution in the number of pupils attending the schools?—In a great measure certainly to the diminution of the population. I do not know any other cause that would account for any considerable diminution, except in the case of the Roman Catholics whose attendance upon our school is diminished in a greater proportion than can be accounted for in that way, and that, I believe, has arisen, if you think it necessary that I should give a reason for it—

20555. It is not necessary to go into the details of time; but do you think that the diminution of the population of the country generally accounts for the diminution of the pupils attending the Church Education Society's schools to, in round numbers, about one-half of what they were about twenty years ago?—There may have been other concurrent causes. I have not heard of any in particular. I have not heard of any diminution to any extent arising from the fact that those who ought to attend the schools remained away from any objection to them.

20556. In the plan which your lordship has had the goodness to suggest to the Commission for bringing the Church Education Society's arrangements within the pale of the action of the State, do you consider that that would have the effect of enabling the schools to be conducted more energetically, to increase the number of pupils attending, and altogether to place the operations of the Church Education Society in a more vigorous and extensive position than they now are?—Most decidedly. Our schools are confessedly in many places defective, arising from defective funds. I should hope that that great source of defective education amongst us would be diminished, if not removed, by receiving aid from the State.

20557. And the operations of the society would then become more completely expanded?—I do not say that.

20558. And its schools more numerous and better attended?—With respect to the number of schools I am not sure that there would be any increase; and whether there would be any increase in the number of scholars would depend on circumstances. It would not be a necessary result of the change, but I suppose it would be almost a necessary result of the change, that the schools would be better.

20559. At present does your lordship consider that any special influence is made use of by the Society for the purpose of inducing Roman Catholic children to attend Church Education Society schools?—Well, that is a very wide question. I have no doubt that the zeal of some men may lead them to exert all their influence very strenuously to get Roman Catholics to attend Church Education schools. There is nothing that can be called

special influence made use of by the Society; but as to answering for what may be done in individual cases, I am sure I could not venture to do that.

20560. But putting aside the case of individual evil, which will occur at all times and in all Churches, your lordship considers that the attendance of the Roman Catholic pupils in Church Education Society schools is voluntary and by the consent of their parents?—Yes; but I am sure that staying away from them is not always voluntary. I do think that there is influence exercised over them, but not so often to induce them to go to those schools as to make them stay away from them.

20561. Then, under the improved arrangements which your lordship suggests, by which the funds of the Society should be augmented by grants given as the result of examinations, probably for secular instruction, where the State would pay for the secular instruction, have you any reason to suppose that the number of Roman Catholic pupils as attendance would be still further diminished or become less than what it now is?—The tendency of it would be to increase the number, for this reason, that Roman Catholics set a great value upon the benefits of education, and I am sure in some instances, in which they attend Church Education schools, it is because they think, whether truly or not, that they will get a better education there than in the neighbouring National schools. I do not say that in any National schools, but then in the neighbouring National schools. The more, then, that our schools are improved the greater probability there would be of the attendance recurring some accounts in some places from that cause. That is the only way in which I think it would increase or diminish the numbers. I do not think it would have any tendency to diminish the numbers, at least, I cannot see how.

20562. Your lordship mentioned that you regarded as the fundamental object of the system of education the religious education, and that on that ground the reading of the Bible was made the keystone, if I may use the expression, of the arrangements of the school, and that the Roman Catholic children although excluded from learning the formulary of the Church of England were still expected and obliged, if they attended the school at all, to join in the reading of the Scriptures in the Authorized version?—I think that both the noble Chairman and you, Sir Robert, seem to misunderstand what the primary object of our schools was. You seem to regard them as schools intended for the nation. They were intended for the nation just in the way in which the Established Church was intended for the nation. But as its members are not commensurate with the population, so the attendance upon our schools is not commensurate with the part of the population who require elementary education. Our object was to meet the difficulty, in which we were placed, by the establishment of the National system. A Rule was adopted with respect to religious education, which, whether rightly or wrongly, we regarded as one that we could not conscientiously adopt, and therefore, whatever were the advantages arising from connecting our schools with the National system, we could not do it. That was our position. We then sought for a modification of this Rule, such as would allow of our forming a connection with the National system. Upon every ground both of interest and duty our desire was to aid Government in the attempt to extend the benefits of education to this country, provided we could do so consistently with our conscientious views of what our duty was. It was not until we failed to obtain such a modification, that the Church Education Society was formed. Its immediate formation arose out of this fact, that numbers of schools were left without adequate means, or anything like adequate means of support, and that, therefore, new exertions were made to obtain support for them, and very especially in England, to which we resort in such emergencies. Those who might support there were not acting in concert. They were, therefore, confiding with each other, and the inconvenience of this state of things, I think,

Dev. 2, 2000  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Oxford.

Dec. 3, 1856  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Osnabrück.

first suggested the formation of a society formed of those who held the same principles with respect to religious education, and were to a certain extent in the same difficulties arising from those principles. Then the late Dr. William French, after conferring with some of his friends in the country, came up to town with the view of forming such a society, and the Bishop that was in town with the late Primate at their head were consulted upon it, and the Church Education Society was the result. The second fundamental rule expresses what the object of the society was, and that object was such as might be supposed to grow out of the historical origin which I have described. It was, as I have before stated, to provide sound religious and moral instruction for the children of the Church. But, considering our position as the Church of the State, and considering our relations with our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen, to whom we cannot do anything like the good that we should desire to do, it was thought, as it always was with respect to Church schools, that part of our duty—not the most important part, but still a part—was to make them as extensively useful beyond our own children as we could do without interfering with what ought to be the primary object with respect to them. That is the history of the society, and that is the history of the rule, and if the rule were read with the knowledge of the history, they would be better understood and more kindly judged. The first fundamental rule merely states what the name of the society was to be, but it is not without its import too, for its name is the Church Education Society for Ireland. The second is, “the objects of the society are to assist schools at present existing in the country, and to establish new schools on an improved system, for the purpose of affording to the children of the Church instruction in the Holy Scriptures and in the Catechism, and other formularies of the Church, under the direction of the bishops and parochial clergy, and under the tuition of teachers who are members of the United Church of England and Ireland.” And therefore in judging of our rules, they ought to be read in reference to this text, whether they are proper rules for the schools of a society having this as its primary object, and taking in the other, of extending its benefits as a secondary object—an important object, indeed, but still a secondary one.

20643 I quite understand the position of the society, and that, as far as the admission of Roman Catholic children is a concession upon the part of the society—I should rather say that the concession was in the modification of what a strict Church rule ought to be, that is, that the formularies of the Church, as you perceive, though they are to be taught in the school, are not made by any manner of daily instruction. That was left, I think, entirely to the parochial clergyman. All that was provided for on the part of the society was, that the masters should be persons qualified to carry on that instruction under the direction of the clergy, by being members of the Church of England and Ireland, and that they should be the legitimate purport for the occupation of the school, because the object of the schools of the society was to afford “to the children of the Church instruction in the Holy Scriptures and in the Catechism.” I think the concession is rather in not exacting other formularies of the Church from Roman Catholic children in attendance upon that instruction.

20644 Attendance upon the formularies of the Church.—Yes.

20645 The reading of the Holy Scriptures, in the version of the Church of England, is an integral part of the general business of the school.—Yes, not merely the reading of the Scriptures, I should say, but instruction therein, and in that it differs from the Kildare place society that prescribes it.

20646 You have described also, that in the course of the secular instruction, the schoolmaster and whatever clergyman chooses to visit the school possess the privilege of introducing such references to religious and moral instruction as the subjects in hand, or as he may consider that the occasion calls for.—Certainly;

I would go further than that; I would say that it is the duty of the parochial clergyman to do so; and by our rules he may do it.

20647 Then, the school must be considered, of course it is, I may say, probably the heart of the Church Education Society, that the school must be considered as being essentially doctrinal throughout the whole of its arrangements.—By no means essentially doctrinal. It is quite essential that no instruction given in it shall be contrary to what we regard as sound doctrine, but it is not necessary that our doctrines should be constantly quoted, but that where a moral lesson is to be given, if the clergyman ascertains it to be referred to its proper foundation in Holy Scripture.

20648 But those explanations would be conceived and given entirely in the spirit of the Church of England, necessarily according to the instruction of the school and of the society.—Well, in an important sense they would be given in the spirit of the Church of England, that is to say, there would be nothing in it contradictory to the principles of the Church of England, but it is not necessary that it should involve anything peculiar in the principles of the Church of England, for example, if a boy exhibited a quarrelsome spirit, called names, provoked another boy in the school, he might receive a rebuke on the part of the master for disturbing the order of the school, and there might be an end of it. If the clergyman thought fit to reprimand him in what light such expressions of angry temper on his own part, and such a provocation of angry temper on the part of another, was regarded by God, he would turn to the Bible and show him what is said about it there. That is all that I mean. But I do not suppose that he would ever turn to the articles of the Church or to any of its formularies for the purpose of confirming his reproof of the boy.

20649 But still what has been described as the atmosphere of the school, the general feeling and sentiment which would be expressed by the ordinary business and instruction of the school, would be all such as would harmonize with the spirit of the Church of England, and certainly not that which would have any special Presbyterian or Roman Catholic feeling.—Certainly not, but not necessarily antagonistic either, because we have many common principles, I do trust and hope, and a common foundation, I hope, for them in the Scriptures, so that it might be in perfect harmony with Presbyterian and Roman Catholic principles, but not necessarily. It might also, doubtless, be antagonistic.

20650 Would your lordship then think that an arrangement such as you have proposed, which would increase the vitality of the operations of the Church Education Society, would increase their funds, and give them more means of increasing the efficiency and activity of their plan of teaching, and would afford additional inducements to Roman Catholic children to attend these schools, could be expected to meet the approbation of the Roman Catholic community.—It is obvious, on the contrary, that the effects which have been enumerated, as likely to result from the modification that I speak of in the connection between the State and the schools that it supports would, so far as they go, have a contrary tendency, and would not be pleasing to a great portion of the Roman Catholic community. But it is not for me to say whether, considering the whole plan, and other consequences arising from it, it might not be acceptable to them. That is, as I said before, for themselves to determine, not for me.

20651 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Does your lordship regard it as of any importance to the interests of the State to have children of the different religious denominations trained in the same schools and receiving secular instruction together?—I don't think that I estimate that advantage as highly as other persons do, but I am sure that that advantage, wherever it may be, like other advantages, must be obtained by a proper consideration of what it costs, and what are the means

Dec 2, 1868.  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Cascady.

of securing it. And I think a great deal too much may be sacrificed to the attainment of that object.

20672. You are aware, I presume, that the Commissioners appointed in June, 1826, and who seem to have been unanimous in their report, laid this down as a fundamental principle, that such a system should be established as should unite children of all religious denominations in the same school, except when it should become unreasonably necessary to separate them for the purpose of religious instruction, you are aware of that principle?—I am perfectly aware of it, and aware also of their recommendation that while new schools should be established upon that footing, all the parochial schools in existence, in all of which a Scriptural and Church education was carried on, should be maintained, and the number of them extended by the State.

20673. Can your lordship say how many archbishops and bishops of the Established Church were in Ireland in 1826?—I really cannot. I cannot say what vacancies may have occurred in the body throughout the year.

20674. May I ask were you one of them at that time?—No, indeed, I was not; nor until ten years after.

20675. Are you aware that they approved of this fundamental principle?—They are, moreover, fully aware of the advantages attendant upon the instruction of children of different religious persuasions in one common school, since it may be expected that the kindly feelings generated, by means of such association in childhood and youth, will spread their influence over the subsequent periods of human life?—Yes, I think that is a true view of the question as far as it goes, but I think it is only a one-sided view of the question, because I think that those influences which are there described, I think partly, as the proper result of such a union, in early life might be counteracted, and more than simply counteracted, by other circumstances connected with this mixed education, if they were to separate at a certain hour when religious education was going on, and if it were to be the subject of discussion amongst them, as it naturally, almost necessarily would be, upon what grounds they separated, and why it was that the children that went away were not to take a part in the religious education, that the children that remained received? I can easily conceive that the fact of their being united in the school might lead to wider divisions than their being educated in separate schools.

20676. You are aware, I presume, that the archbishops and bishops also approved of selections from the Scriptures being read in their own schools?—I believe so, I am assenting to what you say as taking it for granted.

20677. I am reading from their document—and that they objected to the pretensions to exclusive sovereignty put forth by the Church of Rome in Ireland?—I am sure that the archbishops and bishops did so, but whether on that occasion or not is really more than I know.

20678. Are you aware that in that document put forward by the archbishops and bishops of the Established Church, in the year to which I refer, they asserted and maintained this sovereignty for themselves in the matter of education?—I do not know whether they did or not. You are referring to a document that I perhaps knew at one time, but if I did, it has faded from my mind so much that I am unable to answer any particular question as to its details, and I think I shall be obliged to decline answering, or making an attempt to answer, questions with reference to what I so imperfectly remember.

20679. In the document to which I refer they further state that they do not "afford to conceal their grief at beholding the clergy of the Established Church deprived of the trust committed to their hands by the Legislature of superintending National schools," may I ask your lordship do you adhere to or recede from this position now, representing the Church Education Society?—I am not sure that I understand the question. If you

mean to ask whether I think that the Church ought to have the direction of National education, my answer is, that I think it ought, at least, so far as this—that as the Established Church is chosen as the Church of the State, if its schools carry out its principles, they ought to receive the support of the State. But if, as is plainly possible, it appeared that, in the same way that the Church itself is not commensurate with the population, the Church schools did not supply the educational wants of the population, and that there was no hope of a remedy in that respect, so that they should become, strictly and properly speaking, National schools, then I think the State, in its parental character, ought, within certain limits, to extend aid to other schools. What I mean is this, that though the Church schools had a primary claim upon the aid of the State, others ought, under the circumstances that I have stated, to receive aid as a matter of proper consideration on the part of the State, as the common parent of all. But what we complain of is that, not only was the proper order reversed—that not only were the Church schools not the State schools, but that when the Church schools sought for a portion of the aid that was extended freely to other schools, they were refused any portion of it. This is what we have for a good while complained of.

20680. You are aware, I presume, what the claim of the Primate and Protestant Bishops in 1826 was?—I really am not aware of what the precise claims of the Primate and the Protestant clergy may have been in 1826. But this I am sure of, that, in supporting the Church Education Society—the Church Education Society, which had no existence in 1826—I have acted with the Primate and with the Bishops and Clergy of the Church in the period which has elapsed since the first establishment of the society. And I do not think it would influence either me or them if at another period, if it be so, the Primate, and the Bishops, and the Clergy took a different view of what the interests of the Church were, or what its duty was. I do not know, however, that they did so.

20681. Taking for granted, as historically we are informed that they did, may I ask does the Church Education Society as its representatives now claim to be the appointed guardians of the education of the country?—I really hardly know how to answer that question. They certainly make no such claim in putting forward the case of the Church Education Society. On the contrary their position, for a good many years, has been—taking as an established fact the existence of the National Board as the educational organ of the State in this country, taking as an established fact also that it is to receive large funds for the purpose of carrying on education according to its principles—the position of the Church Education Society for a long time has been, not claiming a superiority over them, or even dividing empire with them, but claiming support for its own schools.

20682. In all their own schools do they not regard the teaching of the Scriptures in the authorized version as essential, and to be read by all children in the schools?—Well, I have repeated two or three times that they do so.

20683. And I presume that they insist also upon their own interpretation of disputed passages in the Word of God?—Who are "they"?

20684. The manager, and patron, and teacher of those schools?—The office of religious teaching is, in the first instance, in the hands of the parochial clergyman. The parochial school is his school, and every Church Education school is under him, and it is essential to its maintaining a connexion with the Church Education Society, that he should have the superintendence of it. The Church Education Society supplies, of course, the religious education of the children to him. It has been already confided to him without consulting them. Of course it must be left to his discretion. The society cannot prescribe to each clergyman in the country what view he is to take of Scripture, or of his duty in the interpretation of Scripture. That office is intrusted to him, as regards the children in the schools, just as in

Dec. 2, 1868.

The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down.

intended to limit the office of explaining the Scriptures to the adults in the Church.

20565 But I presume we are to take for granted that the patrons and the teachers, in explaining or commenting on the Scripture, will take the Thirty-nine Articles as the basis of Scripture instruction, and the form of Church government as established in this country when matters bearing upon that subject are brought before the notice of the children?—I suppose every honest man will speak according to his own principles and to his own views, in any circumstance in which it is his duty to speak at all; but I believe that the principle is generally acknowledged and acted upon in our schools, that the principles of the Church have a different place in the instruction in Scripture—instruction in Church discipline. Instruction in the formation of the Church not only is given according to the principles of the Church, but it requires express and repeated statements of those principles. All instruction given in the Scriptures, as it is given by the clergyman, is presumed, of course, to be in accordance with the principles of the Church, but it does not in the same way involve the necessity of putting them forward expressly. On many occasions that would be obscuring them unnecessarily, and giving to Scriptural instruction what it is the practice, I believe, and I am sure it is the principle of the Church Education Society, should not be given to it—that is, a controversial character. There are two modes of teaching Scripture—the one controversial, the other non-controversial. The true interpretation of Scripture cannot be taught, where there is a controversy about it, without taking one side in the controversy. But there are two different modes of teaching the truth, notwithstanding—For example, in commenting upon a portion of Scripture it might be pointed out what its true meaning is without any reference to any existing body of Christians who take a different view of it; or it might be pointed out to the children not only what its true meaning is, but that others adopt a false meaning and teach it. That last would, I think, be contrary to the principle and practice of the Church Education Society. I will write respect to the Scripture teaching of children generally.

20566 Do you regard a restriction upon the use of the Bible in education as a grievance to the conscience of the clergy—do they regard it as such?—A very great indeed. It is one, in fact, which they would not submit to. That is the answer to that.

20567 In referring to your lordship's pamphlet, where you speak of the position and duties of the parish clergyman as to the religious instruction of all connected to his cure, do you include in the "all connected to his cure" all parishioners, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Wesleyan Methodists, and so on?—Well, I suppose you know that by the form of Institution to a parish, the bishop connects all the souls in the parish to the cure of the clergyman. In the sense that he ought to be ready to carry out that charge, his cure may be said to extend to all. Practically, however, it extends only to those who choose to submit themselves to him, for we acknowledge the liberty that every man has of separating himself from the Church and taking another guide than the one which she has provided, subject as he is for all his acts to God's judgment for them.

20568 Practically I suppose there is not expected a manifestation of this cure on the part of the clergy for those who are outside their own immediate influence?—That depends entirely on their own sense of their duty. Some take a larger view of it, and others a more limited one. I can give no other answer to that question.

20569 Was it not your objection to the system of National education from the first, and is not it still your objection, that you cannot through it extend the benefits of religious instruction beyond the limits of your own Protestant people?—No, that was not our only or our chief objection. What we objected to chiefly was, that we could not, consistently with the rules of the National system, carry out the religious instruction of our own children in the way that we feel

conscientiously bound to do. That is our chief objection to the system.

20570 I read from your lordship's pamphlet, page 54, "that the question about the modification of these fundamental rules was likely to arise first, and (and, in fact, first arose, from the desire of the clergy to extend the benefits of their schools beyond the limits of their own people." Does that desire still operate upon them?—Most certainly; and the rule that I have so often referred to—the second rule—is framed for the very purpose of enabling them to act upon it.

20571 And is not this desire to extend the benefits of their schools beyond the limits of their own people the result of your position and claim as the National Church?—No. If we ceased to be the National Church to-morrow, I should desire it as much as I do now.

20572 Your lordship says "that such desire should be felt by the clergy was natural and almost unavoidable. The Reformed Church is, as has been often proved, the National Church."—Now, I must say that I cannot enter into this subject at all. The controversy between the two churches in this country, and, indeed, throughout Europe, is one of 500 years' standing. And our position in this country is one much controverted, and since the origin of the Reformed Church in this country has been much controverted. What I say is, I decline entering upon so large a controversial subject, which I should be very sorry to speak about on any oath.

20573 Does your lordship decline to prosecute the examination into this historical department?—I decline entering into either of the controversies referred to, certainly, as having nothing to do with the question.

20574 With regard to the Church Education Society, you say that it is a conscientious objection that is entertained by the clergy who still stand out against the National Board?—That what is?

20575 That it is owing to their conscientious objection that so many of your clergy remain still opposed to the National system of education?—I do say that the ground that they have taken publicly against it is, that they entertain a conscientious objection to its distinctive rule. But if you mean by the question that I should look into the heart of every individual who has made this objection, whether he has made it upon honest and conscientious motives, and not any other, I must decline making any answer to the question.

20576 Then, under these circumstances, you would make no attempt to account for the frequent changes that have taken place in the line of action pursued by the clergy?—If the question refers to the individuals who have changed on the question, I should positively decline to make any attempt to analyse the motives of individuals, or to express any judgment upon the acts of individuals, which I should think extremely ill becoming in me, and especially as a witness.

20577 Does not your plan enforce in all schools religious teaching of a peculiar character?—Well, I think it is for you to judge whether it does or not. I have stated that it does enforce, by a fundamental rule, that daily instruction shall be given in the Bible, at which all children in attendance upon the school are obliged to be present. It also has a rule that catechetical instruction is to be given in the forenoon of the Church in the school, but it adds that none but those children who are children of members of the Church shall be obliged to be present at this instruction. To that extent it enforces teaching of a peculiar character.

20578 Does your society, may I ask, regard it as a duty in connection with its system of education to interfere, if possible, with the faith of other children attending the school?—My society, as you call it, does not regard it as a duty, so far as I know or believe—and I know of nothing that could form a ground for the opinion that it does—so interfere with the faith of other children attending its schools.

20579 Should you regard it as free from the suspi-

Dec. 5, 1865  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Cassidy.

cious of proselytism?—I really do not know how any society, or to what extent any society, or any individual, may be free from the suspicion of anything, but I regard it as free from the design of proselytism, either in its forms, or in its rules, or in its conduct, so far as I know of the society. It has not fallen in any way to take an active part in the regular business of the society; but I think I am pretty well acquainted with what its principles and conduct are.

20600. Did I understand your lordship to say that the Board of National Education prohibits daily instruction in Scripture in the schools under its care?—I never said so.

20601. May I ask what is your view upon the subject?—My view upon that subject is, that the distinctive rule of the system would render daily instruction in Scripture impossible in the form in which it is obligatory with us, that is, to all children in attendance upon the school.

20602. Should I understand you to have stated that the National Board of Education forbid that there should be any reference to, or quotation from Scripture, during the time of secular instruction?—Yes; if there were any children present who did not belong to the Established Church, or whose parents made any objection.

20603. During the hours of united secular instruction?—Exactly.

20604. Is there not a General Lesson, as it is called, or one of similar import, suspended on the wall of each National school, and so far as the General Lesson is concerned, a direct reference to two passages of Scripture?—I believe there is a general rule of the National Board to the effect that you state, and that there is, as you state, a reference to the passages of Scripture in the General Lesson. But what I am speaking of is instruction in Scripture. And I say by that such instruction is forbidden, and something much shorter than instruction; for in the year 1862, as the Commissioners, no doubt, are very well aware, there was an application made, under very peculiar circumstances, to extend liberty to clergymen or laymen patrons of the school to make references to Scripture. There was an application made from the united diocese of Down and Connor and Downargy, presented by the Bishop through the Lord Lieutenant, who was supposed to be, and pretty distinctly intimated, that he was favorable to the application. The application was that the interpretation of the rule of the Board, as regards the reading of the Holy Scriptures, was not to be referred to prevent the manager or teacher of any school from making such references to the Word of God as occasion might demand during the hours of general instruction, provided that under the appearance of exercising this "just right," as they call it, "as religious teaching of denominational character be introduced," and as answer to that application was given by the Secretaries under the direction of the Board. The answer was, that with every desire to extend the benefits of the National system of Education, the Commissioners cannot approve of the modification of the rule with regard to the reading of the Scriptures as proposed by the Memorialists.

20605. Does your lordship not perceive from the question which you have just now made, that the answer of the Commissioners was not with respect to any reference to the Scriptures, but to the reading of the Scriptures?—(Rush.)—"From making such reference to any part of the Word of God." On the contrary, the Bishop intimated that it was under a misapprehension of the nature of his application that the refusal to grant it was given; and he wrote an explanatory letter to His Excellency, saying:—"We did not seek any modification of their rule with regard to the reading of the Scriptures during the hours of religious instruction, but simply permission to make such reference to the Word of God as occasion might demand." And the application so explained was refused. So that the answer of the Board was not only in reference to the reading of the Scriptures, but this subsequent communication with the Board, through

His Excellency, made it clear that the prohibition extended to any reference to Scripture during the time of general instruction.

20606. Now, was not the reply of the Commissioners of National Education simply a refusal to modify the rule with regard to the reading of the Scriptures?—The Bishop addressed the Lord Lieutenant again, saying, that the memorialists did not seek any modification of their rule, with regard to the reading of the Scriptures, during the hours of general instruction; that what they asked was the simple permission to make such reference to the Word of God as occasion might demand. "Your Excellency will perceive," he says, "the marked distinction existing between the reading of Scripture during ordinary school hours, and the occasional reference to the same in the exercise of what we hope will be considered a just right in imparting that 'combined literary and moral' instruction which is required under the rules of the Board." This answer given by the Lord Lieutenant was:—"I have received an intimation from the Commissioners of National Education that the reconsideration of the proposal made by the deputation from the clergy of your diocese, to which you invited them, has not led them to think that they can see their way to any alteration in the present practice."

20607. Has your lordship visited many National schools?—I was never in a National school in my life.

20608. You are aware personally that there is a general reference to Scripture in the General Lesson suspended on the wall of every National school?—I am not aware of it personally; I have seen the rule of the National Board, directing that that General Lesson should be suspended, and I know that the lesson contains two references to Scripture, but how that alters the effect of the distinctive rule of the Board is more than I can perceive.

20609. Are you not also aware that in all schools where the patrons desire it a copy of the Ten Commandments shall be suspended on the walls of the National schools?—I am not aware of the terms of the rule, but if they were as you state I should not know what it has to do with the immediate question.

20610. And that all branches of masters in both tables of the law, the first and second, may by the teacher be brought to the notice of the children in connection with the Ten Commandments suspended in the school?—I am willing to believe that it is so; but I do not know it.

20611. Should I understand your lordship to say that the Church Education Society did not require children to read the Scriptures in the Authorized Version in all their schools?—I did not say so.

20612. I was under the impression that your lordship in reference to Scripture reading said, "I say we make no such requirement," what was the requirement to which your lordship referred in that connection?—Well, to answer that would render it necessary that I should remember your question distinctly, which, without intending any disparagement of its importance, I must confess I do not. It can be referred to. My recollection was that you asked me about the requirement of the Church Education Society, whether it required that there should be religious teaching of a peculiar denominational character in its schools—I said that there was no such requirement. That is at least my recollection of the question and answer. If you think it worth referring to the evidence to ascertain whether my recollection is right or wrong you can. But whatever I said, it must be plain that that is what I meant, for I have read out the rule, and I have repeated it more than once—viz., that not merely the reading of the Holy Scriptures but instruction in the Holy Scriptures is to be given daily to all children in attendance who are able to read.

20613. Do you regard the religious instruction in all your schools then as in any sense compulsory or required?—I regard it (that is, the instruction in the Holy Scriptures) as compulsory in the same in which arithmetic or spelling is compulsory, or any other part of the daily business of the school is compulsory, but I

Dec. 2, 1886,  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Cloyne.

regard it as not compulsory in this sense, that no child is obliged to attend our schools; and so far as I know there are no improper means used to induce any children to attend them.

20614. Archbishop Bell of Waterford was a secretary, I believe, of the Church Education Society?—He was, and I believe he is; of that, however, I am not sure.

20615. Does your lordship concur in the statement upon this point as made by Archbishop Bell?—I quote from the evidence of 1854, where Mr. O'Connell, Secretary of the National Board, and a member of the Established Church, says:—"In the Church Education schools the reading of the Bible in the Protestant Authorized Version is compulsory. This fact is occasionally denied. But a speech made by the Ven. the Archbishop of Waterford, who is secretary of this very society here, while on a deputation to Bath, fully proves that no child will be admitted to one of those schools without its parent having previously assented to what must in the case of a Roman Catholic be deemed a violation of conscientious principle. The speech will be found in the *Bath Chronicle* of the 17th of June, 1853, and has been copied into the *Waterford Mail* of the 30th of June, and Archbishop Bell informed me it is a correct report of his speech. The following is an extract from it:—"If the Church Education Society received money from the National system they would be compelled to receive into the school children whose parents objected to their reading the Scriptures, and they would not have the power either to reject them or to insist upon their receiving Scripture education." Does your lordship concur in the statement made by the Archbishop of Waterford, as representing the Church Education Society?—I must take leave to say I do not think it is a very convenient way of carrying on an examination, if you want to ascertain any sentiments on the rules of the Church Education Society, to read out another's mode of expressing what those rules involve; and then to read out comments by Mr. O'Connell, upon what he has said, to the effect that it amounts to an admission that there is compulsory education in our schools; and finally, to ask me whether I agree with the statement or not. I would rather express my own views of the rules of the Church Education Society, which I am prepared to do, or give an explanation of them in my own terms, without being called upon to adopt or reject explanations given by others. And if you allow me, I will now repeat the explanation which I have given. I am perfectly ready to say in what sense religious education is compulsory, and in what sense I regard it as non-compulsory in our schools. It is known, and I have repeated it pretty often to-day, that it is a rule of our schools that all children in attendance should receive instruction in the Holy Scriptures daily. No child can attend our schools without complying with that rule as well as all the other rules; and in that sense religious education may be said to be compulsory in our schools. But the notion that compulsory religious education entitles us to, I fancy is this, that a constraint is put upon the scholar, and that he is made to read the Bible whether he will or not at a certain hour. There is no such compulsion as that existing in our schools, because the child comes in with the certain knowledge himself, and with the certain knowledge of his parents that he will be required to do this. He does it, as he complies with every other part of the rules of the school, as a matter of compulsion, in this sense, that he would not be allowed to attend the school if he did not comply with it. In no other sense is religious instruction compulsory; and I think the word "compulsory" suggests a state of things with respect to the schools and the scholars which is not true.

20616. Allow me, my lord, in putting the next question to say, that I should not have made any question from the testimony of any witness examined at a previous Commission had it not been somewhat usual before this Commission, and I simply wish now to know from you, as representing the Church Edu-

cation Society, whether you are disposed to concur in the view given by Archbishop Bell, claiming power either to reject children coming to the school or insist upon their receiving Scripture education?—Archbishop Bell, or any other patron of a school, would be only carrying out the rules of the society in doing so. The effect of the existence of this rule is so far from rendering religious education compulsory that it renders it voluntary, because the parent has thereby distinct notice of what his child will be obliged to comply with; whereas if he were received into the school without any notice it might be afterwards said he was dragged into a school where he was forced to read the Scriptures.

20617. Does your lordship think that there are many parishes in Ireland in which Protestant minorities are very small, and where an efficient school for such of a denominational character could not be well established?—I am sure that there are many parishes in Ireland in which congregations in one church are very small, and in consequence our schools must be very small, and I am sure that very small schools cannot be made efficient in any proper sense. But I am sure that in the same way in which it is our duty to attend to the small population of small parishes, and to give them sound instruction according to our views, spiritual instruction, and to provide for them a divine service, according to what we regard to be a pure ritual, in the same way it is our duty to look after the children of those parishes, and to provide as far as we can a school for them in which they may receive education according to our principles and their own. And in carrying out this view of his duty I have known a clergyman, who was unable to pay a schoolmaster, carry on the education of the children himself, and I agreed with him in thinking that it was his duty to do so, as he was placed in circumstances in which he had, unfortunately, a great deal of leisure from having very little more occupation of a properly clerical kind in his parish.

20618. The proportion of the Protestant population to the general population of your diocese is very limited, I perceive?—I am aware of the fact.

20619. Are the statistics, as given in "Them," does your lordship suppose correct?—I think five per cent. of the Established Church in Kilkenny and about nine per cent. in Fermagh?—Well, really, I cannot answer for the accuracy of such statistical statements.

20620. Pretty accurate, I presume?—Well I wish to say, once for all, that so it is in the power of the Commission to obtain statistical information, with respect to education, from other sources from which it may be more accurately obtained—as the officers of the society, for example, are ready to attend upon the Commission and to give information with respect to what it is their proper business to be well acquainted with; and so I have not informed myself about statistics so as to carry them accurately in my head, and able to answer off book with respect to them, I should beg to decline giving any statistical information. If I thought I should be withholding any information from the Commission by refusing to give it myself I should certainly make the best attempt that I could to give it, but as I know that they can obtain information in a much more accurate form than I could give it I beg to decline making any answers to any statistical questions.

20621. I presume you are aware of the fact that in your diocese, of the Protestant population the far larger number of them are in such circumstances that their children ought not to be attending common schools?—I declare I do not know whether there is or not.

20622. Does your lordship imply that in schools with no attendance of ten, or six, or eight children a school can be set up and efficiently worked which should have any claim upon the funds of the State for its support?—Well, my claim that would be affected as asking the school, I suppose it could hardly have, but a claim in proportion to the numbers it certainly would have, if the object of the State is to obtain secular education

for its individual members, I presume, and if there were to be for the education furnished to a small population a proportionably small payment. But that question is a mere matter of courtesy, I think.

20625 Should your lordship expect that small schools with an attendance of four or six should be set up in different parishes?—By whom?

20626 By any parties?—They are set up, if there are to more, by the clergy.

20627 Are there not very many parishes in which there are no Protestant schools?—I am sorry to say that there are a good many parishes in Ireland in which there are no Protestants.

20628 But no Protestant schools where there are Protestant children?—No; I think, on the contrary, there are very few. There are not five in my diocese to which that description applies, not more than number. I take the number as a safe one. At the same time I really will stop here; for I will not answer statistical questions.

20629 You are acquainted with Kilkenny. Have you visited the model school in Kilkenny?—Never, nor, I might add, though you did not ask me, do I visit our own schools. It is not my system to visit schools.

20630 There are several children of the Established Church, I perceive by the statements in the annual report of the Commissioners, who attend the model school at Kilkenny?—If the fact is stated in the annual report of the Commissioners you know upon much better authority than you would if I told it to you, but I believe it is the case.

20631 Could your lordship state at what time it was established?—No; I could not, indeed.

20632 Could you say whether any of the parents of the children now attending the model school in Kilkenny have been educated there?—In the model school?

20633 Yes?—I should think it impossible. I do not positively know, however.

20634 Do you notice amongst the members of the Established Church in Kilkenny “indifference” in religion to “an immense extent”?—There are questions that I cannot answer at all. What I conceive to be the proper business of this Commission is—at least what I have come for is to give information, so far as I can give, with respect to principles, rules, objects of improvement, and so forth. But as to entering into the general question of Roman Catholics and Protestants and the state of the Protestant religion in different parts of the country, it is a thing that I would beg to decline doing.

20635 I referred merely to a statement that was made to the effect that owing to the instruction in the model schools of Kilkenny there was a considerable amount of indifference amongst Protestants, and “indifference” to “an immense extent,” and I was anxious, if your lordship could, to have that statement contradicted or confirmed?—I neither confirm nor contradict it from any positive knowledge. I do not believe, however, that indifference exists to an immense extent or any unusual extent. I should say that I fear there is hardly any parish in Ireland in which it could be truly said that there was a good deal of indifference amongst its population with respect to what they ought to be most concerned about. But if there is anything peculiar in the state of Kilkenny in this respect it comes neither within my knowledge nor my belief.

20636 Sir Robert Keble?—I had the honour of putting a question to your lordship with reference to whether the Roman Catholic community would be likely to be satisfied with the arrangement which your lordship suggested for promoting the efficiency of the Church Education Society schools, and I should wish to obtain your lordship's opinion, if you have no objection to give it, whether if the Roman Catholic community were willing to withdraw their objections to such an arrangement as you suggest being carried into effect, your lordship, as representing the opinions of the Church Education Society, would be willing to

meet their views by arranging not to admit Roman Catholic children to your schools, but to bring your schools to the condition of being exclusively Church of England schools?—For myself I say that I should not consent to that arrangement, and although I hold no proxy from the Church Education Society on the question, my opinion is that it would not consent to such an arrangement. And my conviction further is that if the Society did consent to it, the clergy would not; that the clergy of the country would not consent to maintain schools in communion with the State, or otherwise, on the condition that a certain child brought by his parents should have the door of the school shut in his face as the result of a rule arising out of a compact with the State, or in any other way. That is my conviction. For myself I can say I would not consent to it. But I think I ought to add, in justice to the society and to myself, that I should not only have no objection, but that I should desire that the utmost publicity should be given to the character of the school and the nature of the education to be given at it, so as to secure, so far as it is possible by any previous precaution, that no child should enter it whose parents should be in ignorance of the nature of the education that was to be received there. I should be not merely willing but glad to consent to such an arrangement.

20637 So that any parent bringing his child to that school, or any child entering that school, should be made perfectly aware that the school was a Church of England school?—Yes, and that the education that was given in it should be perfectly made known, and as much publicity as possible given to it, so as to secure, so far as any previous precaution could render it, that no one could enter it in ignorance of the nature of the education to be given.

20638 Mr. Gwynne?—I hold in my hand a published charge of your lordship, in the year 1845, and in a note at page 271, I find a statement of what your opinion is as to the views of the Church Education Society, and I should like to hear your lordship explain that opinion, because it startled me a good deal when it first came across me. It is a note in reference to the correspondence between Sir Robert Peel and the prelates?—With the Primate.

20639 You refer to the statements of Sir Robert Peel, in his correspondence, in which he states that

“It should be explicitly avowed and generally understood as its leading principle (the National system of education) that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the positive religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians.”

There is a reference then to a note, which I presume is your lordship's note, and stamp?—

“In each of his three letters Sir Robert Peel puts forward this theological principle, as if he thought that in Ireland it were not acted on in the schools of the National Board, whereas in the Church Education Society it is the principle and the practice to abstain from all attempts to influence or disturb the belief of any dissenting children, Roman Catholics or Protestants, who may attend our schools, and as exemplars, so far as I have, has been made of any violation of this principle, even in a single instance.”

I understood your lordship to say that in reading the Bible, and in giving religious instruction, it was the duty of the teacher, or whoever gave the instruction, to explain and teach the truths of religion involved in it. I should like to know exactly how that is not an attempt to influence or disturb the religious belief of any dissenting child?—I think, as well as I remember, that the two words, influence and disturb, should be taken together, and it should not be supposed that I meant there was no attempt to influence the minds of the children, because that would be the same thing as excluding every good and useful influence that could be exercised over them. The two words should be taken together, and the meaning would be then seen to be, I think, influence with a view to disturb.

20640 I will be happy to receive any explanation you wish to give?—What I mean to say is, that there was to be no attempt made, the object of which was to disturb the religious belief of any child in the school. In that sense I adhere to the statement quoted of what I believe to be the principles and practices of the

Dec 2, 1862

The Lord Bishop of Cussey.

Dec. 3, 1885.  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Down

Church Education Society. But that there should be no attempt to inform or guide the mind of the child in a way that might possibly disturb its belief, it would be absurd to assert, and I never meant to assert it. The teaching of Scripture, every body knows—even the least controversial teaching of Scripture, may have that tendency, and I have known it to have the effect. I have known—not in the case of children, but in the case of grown persons—that simply the reading of the Scriptures has led to a total change in their religious views. That such a change has happened, therefore, as the result of the uncontroversial teaching of the Scriptures in our schools I can well believe, though I must say I have never heard of a Roman Catholic child's religion being changed in any of them. What I meant was, that there are two modes of teaching Scripture—I believe I said this before, or something like it, but I will repeat it—that there are two modes of teaching Scripture, the controversial and then the uncontroversial mode. I suppose there is no doubt that before controversies existed the Holy Scriptures were taught, and if so, they must have been taught without any reference to the controversies that have since arisen. No one will doubt that its true meaning was then evolved by this teaching, but of course the result of it would be that when controversies arose afterwards it had given an impression that was contrary to one side, and in accordance with the other. I believe I am spending a good many words in what might be said in a very few. What I mean is, that there is a controversial exposition of Scripture, and a non-controversial exposition of Scripture. I should wish to take an illustrative illustration. Suppose the teacher explaining one of the pastoral epistles were to point out the bearing of a passage upon the constitution of the Church, or upon the government of the Church, one man might blush what he believed to be no proper meaning without referring at all to the constitution of a Church that was in opposition to it; and another might add to the exposition, "Our Presbyterian brethren take a different view of this passage, but they are wrong." Now, the former is the mode in which I believe the Scripture is intended to be taught, and actually is taught in the general classes in our schools. That is what I meant—that there would be no direct attempt to disturb the belief of any child.

20639. The difference is made up in the words—"there is no direct attempt"—though it may necessarily be indirect in the recalculation of truth?—In many instances in teaching the true meaning of Scripture, the necessary result would be that you would teach one side of a controversy.

20640. If I understood exactly the object of your lordship's observations with respect to the duties of the Established Church, I understood you said that when a change was given at ordination by the bishop he was bound to give it to all within his charge, and that that included everyone in the parish?—You could not have heard me correctly. I did not say anything about ordination, in which there is no such change, but I spoke about Institution, and also when a clergyman is instituted into a parish all the souls of those in the parish are committed to his care. I never meant that that conveyed the right to exercise any pastoral care where the subjects of it refused to receive it, but I believed that it imposed the duty upon the clergyman to be ready and willing to exercise it.

20641. I presume that your lordship assumes that the fact of a child being brought with the full knowledge of the parent to a school where he will be taught from the Bible, implies a willingness on the part of the parent that the child shall receive that instruction?—Yes, if he has full warning of it.

20642. Does your lordship conceive that the obligation of a lay patron is the same or co-extensive with that of a clerical patron in regard to the duty of requiring religious instruction in the schools under his charge?—I, of course, do not conceive that they are exactly the same, because I have spoken of some obligations of a clerical patron in connection with the

ceremony of Institution, which a lay patron does not undergo. But with respect to the question whether, independently of that, there is any, and what difference between them, which I suppose is the purport of your question, I have no hesitation in saying that I think that they are really different, and that the obligations of the clergyman in that regard are more direct and proving. To what extent a duty of the same kind rests upon a lay patron must depend upon individual conscience, and, accordingly, lay patrons take very different views of their duty in that respect, and we have some amongst the supporters of the Church Education Society who say frankly to us—"We do not take the same view that you do of the nature of that obligation that exists with respect to the religious teaching in the schools, but as you take that view of it, and as it is a conscientious conviction upon your part, we think we ought to support you in maintaining it for yourselves, and we will do so." But that does not prevent some of them from being patrons of National schools in which they discharge another duty, a duty to their Roman Catholic tenantry as they believe.

20643. If a patron be willing to give religious instruction in any school, and appoints a time within which that religious instruction is to be given, is not the patron discharged from any moral responsibility if a parent refuses to allow his child to receive that instruction?—I think the moral responsibility must depend a good deal on the individual views of his duty as patron, provided, that is, that they have been conscientiously formed, and I must refer that to every individual patron. Some take one view and some another. If you ask what my own view would be if I were a lay patron I will give it, I should not think myself discharged thereby from moral responsibility in the case.

20644. Master Brooke.—Are there any by-laws suppressed, or any secret rules in connection with the Church Education Society?—I have never known of any, and if I did, I should call on the Church Education Society to make them public, and if they refused to make them public, I should feel constrained to sever my connection with it.

20645. Have you heard of any rules except those presented every year at the head of the reports?—Never.

20646. Is there any man, or body of men, who have any right to state what are the opinions or the views of the Church Education Society, other than those expressed in these few pages?—I should think not, except that if a dispute arose about the meaning of some of the rules, the members of the Committee in the first instance, and then the members of the Society would be called on to declare in favour of one view or other: and in one case at least they did so very emphatically, as you know.

20647. I presume your lordship does not undertake to state beyond what you find in these printed rules, the sense, or wishes, or intentions of the Church Education Society?—No, of course if in the last public declaration of the views of the members of the Society in 1840, they had undergone any considerable change, I am tolerably sure I would have been made acquainted with it. I have no reason to think there was any change.

20648. With regard to the benefits that might be supposed to result from the adoption of such a plan as you have suggested, have you considered whether it would be looked upon as a benefit to subject the Church Education Society schools adapted to that system to the State, to the inspection of the public Inspectors of the National Board?—Well, independently of the question of advantage or disadvantage to our schools, I think that the State has a right and that it is its duty, to see that, if they give us money, we should give them value for it. Independently, however, of the State's right in the matter, I think it would be highly beneficial to the schools that they should be subject to regular inspection from well qualified persons appointed by the State.



20643. You would think it would have a very stimulating effect on both schoolmasters and scholars?—I think so decidedly.

20650. Supposing the Inspectors were taken from all dependencies indifferently, would you object to the inspection of Roman Catholic Inspectors?—Certainly not, if the inspection were confined to secular education.

20651. In my question, I am looking to the possible benefit that might follow from the adoption of such a scheme as you propose, namely, the State looking only to the secular education, and the mode of enforcing it thoroughly, and leaving the religious education to the parents or managers of the schools?—I should like as little as possible to make an abstract statement on such a subject, because while I conceive there would be no objection in a general way to Roman Catholics being amongst the Inspectors, and taking their place in examining Church schools as well as others, I can easily conceive that an arrangement might possibly be made, under the peculiar circumstances of the country, which would give a preponderance to Roman Catholic Inspectors, or establish a kind of Roman Catholic inspectors, which I should feel called upon to object to. Though there were no reason to object to it when stated in the abstract form, I might find it necessary to object to it in the form that was actually adopted. It would be a great deal better, with respect to such points, to reserve all discussion of them, if the general principle were agreed upon.

20652. What would you suggest with regard to the training of teachers, supposing that such a plan as you suggest were adopted for the public training of teachers?—I believe there are two very good training systems in existence, and I don't see why they should not be both supported.

20653. You would be inclined to support denominational training schools?—I mean training schools in the hands of the clergy?—I think if they were adequately supported it would be much more satisfactory to both parties. But, on the other hand, I don't see any insuperable objection when persons of the age of candidate schoolmasters come up to the training school,—that they should be trained together in what would be their proper business as secular teachers, and that they should receive religious instruction together. The education of such persons is quite different from primary education.

20654. Mr. Stokes—Are you to understand that the difficulty felt by managers of Church Education schools in admitting children to the secular instruction without giving them religious instruction does not rest upon a claim to territorial jurisdiction on the part of the clergy of the parish?—I will not say what it rests upon in the minds of others, but I have said that as in my mind it does not rest upon such claims, for I have said distinctly that if we could be the Established Church to-morrow, I should feel it necessary to insist upon the condition just as much as I do now. It is with reference to my own duty as the manager of a school that I insist upon the condition, and not with reference to any power or authority I might have over others.

20655. Possible political changes would not remove the difficulty necessarily?—Not with me.

20656. I think you said, in admitting Roman Catholic children to Church Education schools, it was clearly understood that the parents approved of the kind of education given to the children in those schools?—I think that in what I said upon that subject I was speaking rather prospectively than with respect to the past, however desirous he were to send his child to the school, but I have no objection to speak with respect to the past as well as to the future. I cannot be sure that all Roman Catholic parents who suffered their children to come to the Church Education schools were perfectly aware of the education they were to receive there, but I am perfectly sure from the manner in which the controversy has been agitated, and carried into every corner of the country, that they knew they would have to read the Bible.

And, as to the future, as I have said, I should be willing and glad that there should be a full public declaration in any mode that could be devised—supposing even that it was put up as an advertisement in large letters upon the door of the school—which should acquaint every person with the nature of the education to be carried out in the school, and make it certain that no Roman Catholic parent should bring his child there, or suffer him to remain in the school, without being perfectly aware of the education that he was to receive there.

20657. Would there be any objection to such a plan as this, that at every school there should be a book, on the first page of which there should be clearly expressed the rules and regulations of the school, and that the parent, in bringing his or her child for education, should be required to sign a certificate to the effect that he or she had read the rules read, and approved of them, and was prepared to acquiesce in them?—I should have a decided objection to that plan, and I will state my reasons for objecting to it, and it will be seen that it is not inconsistent with the readiness which I have professed to take every precaution to guard against any mistake in the matter. I think a Roman Catholic parent would find it extremely difficult to do what would allow it to be said that he had under his hand given over his child to the Protestant clergyman for religious education. It would be making impediments to the exercise of the free will of the parent, to require him to sign in that way. But for the *bona fide* purpose of acquainting his own mind with the nature of the education he was about to give his child, there are no means that could be devised that I would not consent to. I may be wrong in the distinction that I make, but I think it has a real ground in the peculiar circumstances of the country—though if it were not necessary I should rather not explain myself further on that point.

20658. In relying on the controversies which have raged for a series of years on the subject, do you think the believing classes who send their children to Church Education schools, or primary schools in general, would be sure to have heard of the points that have been raised in this controversy?—Well, I am perfectly certain that they never learn them in the same way that persons of education do; but I am perfectly certain also that there is hardly any parish in which the lower orders are not aware of the character of the Church Education schools to the extent that would let them know that their children would receive an education there which their religious teachers did not approve of, because wherever the Church Education Society school is, it becomes a particular question, of course, whether the children are to be sent to it or not, and I don't think the parents are left very long in ignorance of what the education is that is to be received there, though I don't mean that they learn it from controversial pamphlets.

20659. As you think the book suggested would be objectionable, do you see any objection to the simple plan of having the rules, with regard to religion, printed on cards, one of which should be given to every parent that brought his child to the school?—I should rather have such points to be settled when the time for arranging details comes. But I repeat that I should have no objection to anything which should make a parent acquainted with the system, unless there were something in the mode of doing it which was open to such an objection, such as I have described—something which brought extended influence, as made by the Commissioners in any other quarter, of an opposite kind brought before his mind.

20660. Without going into statistical inquiries, to which your lordship has an objection?—I have no objection to the inquiries, but I have an objection to be called on to answer them myself, as though I have in my mind the results which I have drawn from statistics. I do not remember the details.

20661. May I ask if you observed, as a general

Dec. 2, 1866.  
The Lord  
Bishop of  
Oswy.

result of the educational course, taken in '61, that while more than nine per cent. of the Established Church were attending primary schools, only six per cent. of the Roman Catholics were attending schools of the same class—I may have heard of such a result, but it is not upon my mind, and I cannot say whether it is true or not.

29662. Assuming such to be the result of the Census, wouldn't it follow, then in order to bring Roman Catholics to the same educational status with Established Church children, about 150,000 Roman Catholics more than at present attend ought to be found in primary schools?—Very possibly.

29663. May I ask you, in a National point of view, whether it is not more important to increase the accommodation for the Roman Catholic children, than it is for the Protestant children, already in such much larger numbers attending schools?—Undoubtedly, if it were want of accommodation for Roman Catholic children that created the difference that you describe, and I suppose, truly describe, to exist, it would be desirable to increase the accommodation. But I never heard that there was any want of accommodation, or that that was supposed to be the cause of the small proportion of Roman Catholics attending schools.

29664. May I ask what obligation benedict clergymen take on themselves on institution, in reference to popular education—financially, I mean?—Not any that I know of. There was an old law, under which an oath was administered to them, to the effect that they would keep an English school within the parish. This was generally supposed to mean a free school, but it really meant that they would keep a school for the purpose of teaching English in the parish, and the school was so far from being a free school, that in the very same Act it was provided that they should charge whatever was the customary charge in the same description of schools in the country. It was intended to extend the knowledge of the English language in the country, and it was thought that the clergy, being more immediately under the powers of the Government, they would be more the instruments of extending the language in keeping English schools. They were not schools for the poor. I dare say Minister Brooke and others present will confirm this statement. I do not know how the legal profession may be represented here—but I am sure every lawyer, and I am sure the learned judge here, is well acquainted with the Act and its object.

29665. Is that oath, required by the Statutes of Henry VIII. and William III. no longer taken by benedict clergymen on institution?—A great change has taken place with respect to all oaths, and that amongst others.

29666. Generally, are there not throughout the country large endowments for primary education, which are confined in their application to children of one sect, or at least to Protestant children?—I believe there are not large endowments throughout the country for primary education, or benefits that are confined to one sect.

29667. Would you propose, in extending State aid to Church Education schools, to continue to schools of the same class the monopoly which they now enjoy, of the endowments for primary education?—I believe I might safely, on their part, say they would give up what you call the monopoly of the endowments for primary education, if the endowments possessed by the other denominations were also thrown into some common stock. But I am answering that question entirely off hand, and I am desirous not to be held as giving any fixed opinion whatever on the subject generally. With respect to my own three dioceses, in which there are large numbers of Roman Catholics, the endowments for primary education which the Church enjoys are very small. They consist generally of a house and an acre of ground.

29668. In your bishopric's diocese are there any schools maintained by the Governors of Erasmus Smith's Board?—Yes; I don't think there is one in

the whole diocese of Oswy. There are seven in Farns, and two in Leighton.

29669. In different parts of Ireland is it not the case that the local school often in large blocks by Protestant proprietors, who have the power to exclude from the district schools the character of which they do not approve of?—Whenever it is held in large blocks by Protestant proprietors, they have the ordinary rights of property, and I suppose, can exclude what they don't approve of, at least theoretically they can, but hardly practically.

29670. In some of those districts is not the majority of the people Roman Catholic?—Well, in several districts there are certainly large Protestant proprietors, while the majority of the people are Roman Catholics.

29671. Do you not consider the State is interested in the education of all children of the people without violation of religious freedom?—I think it has shown itself so.

29672. In taking Church Education schools into connection with the system of National aid, would you propose any plan for such districts where there would be no possibility of founding schools on principles acceptable to the majority of the people?—If any real evil of the kind you seem to imagine exists, I think there ought to be a remedy for it of course, but I am not prepared to recognize the existence of the evil, and I am not prepared to say what the remedy ought to be.

29673. Do you ask, generally, for Church Education schools the same aid as is afforded to other schools?—I think there ought to be larger aid. I think there ought to be larger aid on this intelligible principle—whether you approve of it or not is another thing. It is notorious that wherever the population is sparse and few—that whether it is to give religious education to adults, or secular education to non-adults, the cost per head must be considerably greater than where the population is more numerous. The same staff that would educate twenty-four, would be required to educate four, and so on, with respect to other matters. Therefore I say that if it were intended to aid us efficiently, and if the mode of aiding generally was a capitulation allowance, we ought to receive a larger capitulation allowance on principles of justice. But with respect to the objection to adding our schools, which is founded upon the alleged facts, that our religious rules prevent Roman Catholic children from attending, I wish to remark that this objection is not allowed to exclude Roman Catholic schools from aid in England. On looking over some papers which I thought might bear on my examination to-day, I found amongst others an extract that I made, or rather a note that I made, of the contents of a Roman Catholic publication, with which I think you have some acquaintance—that is, the annual report of the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee for 1851. There was a correspondence between the Catholic Poor School Committee and Lord John Russell, who was President of the Council, with reference to some particular school for which application for aid was made. The circumstances of the school were explained for his lordship's information, and proved to be satisfactory on the whole. However, Mr. Lingard was directed to ask his correspondent, who I think was Mr. Langdale, whether there was any objection on the part of the Committee to introduce a rule by which children of all denominations might be admitted to the schools, with the proviso that the children of parents who conscientiously objected to the particular religious education given in the school might be allowed to absent themselves when the religious instruction came on. And the answer was, that there was no objection whatever to such a rule; but it was added that his lordship would be misled if he thought that thereby those children would escape a Catholic education. And the reason was given in this form:—“That the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee profess themselves willing that the children of other denominations should be admitted to their schools, so far as they can be consistently with the preference due to the children of their own communion, and that such other children, if

their parents conscientiously object thereto, shall not be required to attend during the time of catechetical instruction in the doctrines and precepts of the Catholic faith, but they state distinctly that religion is the prevailing principle of all instruction given in Roman Catholic schools, and a deviation from this would, in their opinion, be altogether at variance with the principle and character adopted in Roman Catholic schools. And in practice the education given in connection with secular instruction is so much of a peculiarly religious character, that it is the ground upon which they object to an Inspector who is not a Roman Catholic.

20674. Are you quoting now from Mr. Langdale's letter to Lord John Russell?—No, but up to the last sentence I believe I have been. I presume that what I find after is what I collected from what followed—that the specific ground on which they objected to Inspectors of another religious denomination—and it is notorious they did object, and successfully object to any but Roman Catholic Inspectors—was that an examination in history might involve numerous controversial points in regard to religion. For instance, the character of the civil sovereigns and the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church of the day, and in this realm are the subject of dispute between Roman Catholic and Protestant historians, and the contest between Henry II and St. Thomas of Canterbury is given as a general example of that kind. I quote this as from a Roman Catholic point of view, thinking it quite right. But I can see no objection that can be made to our rule that does not equally apply to all that I have been reading. The principle is identically the same in both cases. We too think it necessary that our religious instruction should permeate the culture of our secular instruction, and therefore we also the right for the clergyman, or the schoolmaster under the clergyman's direction or control, either by referring to Scripture from memory, or by opening the book and reading from it to any extent that he thinks necessary to sustain any moral or religious lesson he is trying to give, among from any source in the school, or from the contents of the school lessons in which the children are engaged.

20675. Is your lordship aware that the system of Government aid established in England is strictly denominational?—I am aware of that, but, however, I do not think that it has anything to do with the principle of the case. What I meant to say was that from whatever quarter an objection to our rule as to religious education comes, it cannot come from the Roman Catholics, for it is their own rule.

20676. In admitting Church Education Society schools in Ireland to aid from Government, would you free schools already in connection with the National Board from the restrictions which now limit the religious instruction?—That is a question of detail which I must leave to those who have the power of determining it. I am aware that no escape can be provided from the disadvantageous position in which we are placed that will not involve some difficulty. The particular question is one upon which I have never exercised my mind.

20677. Would you propose that Church Education Society schools should be aided on a denominational basis, but that other schools should be compelled to be mixed?—I should not ask for the exercise of any compulsion whatever on other schools with reference to their admitting scholars of different religious denominations. I should leave the State to deal with that question as it pleased. We are ready to admit all children of all denominations. But if our schools are aided, they must be aided on a denominational basis in this sense, that these distinctive rules may confine the school to one denomination, and that rule will not be changed.

20678. Do you propose with regard to other schools to continue the rule which confines instruction to secular matters for a certain number of hours in a certain number of days in the week?—Certainly not. I should not object to the repeal or continuance of it.

I should not object to their receiving aid, whether they recited it or retain it.

20679. Does your lordship contemplate that the managers of these schools be left free to adopt such rules with regard to religious instruction as they may prefer?—That is precisely what is the general conception that occurs to me. No doubt cases might arise in which there might be such decided objections to the rules on moral or religious grounds that the State might be called on to regard them as legitimate exceptions to the general rule, but I would have the general rule what I describe.

20680. Would you desire that the Board should continue to exercise any control over the school books in general use?—Yes, if the Board continued to be the educational organ of the Government, which would require some preliminary discussion—I mean of a practical kind. I don't mean any discussion I should carry on here, but if it were settled under a new system that the Board was to be the educational organ of the Government I think it ought to have some control over the books.

20681. Would you propose to give the Board or the Department of State superintending primary schools any control over the books used in those primary denominational schools?—I should be disposed, decidedly, to give a fairly constituted Board considerable control. I think it very likely that I should be prepared to concede any extent of control that the Roman Catholics would be prepared to submit to. I should be prepared to concede to it. In fact I should think it right to give it such a measure of legitimate control, as would be necessary to give efficacy to its position as the educational organ of the Government. I see no objection to that in the abstract. They might, however, exercise it in such a way that I might feel bound to resist them, and in the last resort to separate from them altogether.

20682. Generally would you be prepared to extend freely and frankly the same advantages to all schools that would be accorded to the Church Education schools upon the suggestion made by your lordship?—Certainly; I don't say that inconveniences would not arise, but the advantages under the actual circumstances of the country, would predominate, and that is all we can expect.

20683. I think I understood you to say that the multiplication of schools beyond the requirements of the localities was an evil in reference to the expense and efficiency of the schools?—So far as the efficiency of a school is concerned it is an evil that it should be small, but that is only one aspect of it—it may be necessary.

20684. You think the advantages must then counterbalance the evils of the multiplication of the schools?—I did not say so. I don't think that the question in the abstract can be settled in either way. I think it might be a matter of necessity in some localities.

20685. Bishop of Meath.—May I ask your lordship whether the statement you have made now, with regard to your proposed scheme, would meet the approbation of the Church Education Society, as a body?—Your lordship's testimony on that subject would, perhaps, be as good, or perhaps better than mine. My impression is that it would.

20686. Of course in localities where there is a sparse Protestant population, the number of the children who attend the Church Education schools is necessarily small, and the State might not be able to reach all those cases. Is it your lordship's opinion that the society itself, and its members, from their own resources, would be able to make provision for those exceptional cases?—It is my hope they would, and for this reason, that the funds that now go to the maintenance of schools, would be freed to a considerable extent by State aid, and there could be no better application of them, and none, I think, which would commend itself more to those who contribute from feelings in favour of the Church Education Society, and interested in it as members of the Church, and

Dec. 3, 1906.

The Lord Bishop of Meath.

Dec. 3, 1905.  
The Right  
Hon. Bishop of  
Cloyne.

could have no better application of the funds than by making a provision against such results in such localities as your lordship has referred to.

20687. Therefore you don't think that mass of that kind would offer any practical difficulty in the settlement of the question on the basis you propose?—I don't mean to say that they would offer no practical difficulty. But I think it is one that ought to be overcome, and I should hope would be overcome to such an extent as not to hinder the predominant advantages of such a course as I suggest in the settlement of the question.

20688. Mr. Deane.—In England, my lord, you are aware that the inspection is denominational. Would it not be possible, and if possible, would it not, in your lordship's opinion, be desirable that it should be so in Ireland? I am supposing that your scheme were carried out, which would be, to a certain extent, if not entirely, a denominational system of education?—I think there is this difficulty which does not arise from the circumstances of the Church Education Society, but from the circumstances of the National system, and its extension through the country,—that the schools of the National system are not denominational in the sense of being composed of one religious denomination, but of several. An objection might naturally arise thence to having Roman Catholic Inspectors exclusively for mixed National schools, while the same objection would more easily apply to having Protestant Inspectors for Church Education Society schools.

20689. I am supposing that the system of education in the country were to become more denominational than it is now?—I don't look to it ever becoming entirely denominational as the result of what I propose. There are some members of the Church who would of themselves approve of the National system, and others who approve of it under the influence of bad habits.—I don't mean any improper influence,—I think even if there was a change, that there are members of the Church who would still go to National schools as they do now. I only throw out that as an objection that might possibly arise to denominational inspection.

20690. Does your scheme make it necessary, or leave it optional, for every portion of a school that such child attending a school shall receive religious instruction?—My plan leaves it optional, but if his school were under the Church Education Society it would not be optional.

20691. Mr. Sullivan.—Would your lordship object in carrying out that system to a strong conscience clause in reference to the children of other denominations?—Most decidedly I should. I would not carry on a school in this country, or any other country, on the condition that I should shut the school door in the face of the parent who brought his child to receive in-

struction; but I would receive the child of any parent only on the condition that he complied with the rule I felt conscientiously obliged to adopt.

20692. That is the rule as to religious instruction?—All the rules of the school, but including, no doubt, the rule for religious instruction.

20693. Mr. Stokes.—Under the Court of Chancery in England there are large endowments for education administered under schemes which provide that every year the manager has to give a certificate that no child has been excluded from the school on religious grounds, and that no child has received religious instruction to which his parents object. Would it be possible for such a certificate to be required from the managers of all denominational schools in this country if they were admitted to National aid?—Well, I don't see any objection,—I am rather taken by surprise by the question,—but I don't see any objection to what I suppose would be your aim,—that is, no child had been admitted contrary to the wishes of his parents. But with the opportunity that there would be to raise in the interval objections up the mind of the parent as to the system of education, I should not at all approve, that after the interval of a year, that a parent should be examined as to whether he felt any objection to the system carried on in the school. To avoid the possibility of misconception, I repeat again I should desire that every presentation should be taken to acquaint him with the system; but that he should be brought up at the end of a year to say he was not acquainted with it, would involve a very grave imputation on the manager of the school from which he could hardly protect himself, and is a thing I would not consent to at all, for I am aware how that could be wrongfully given.

20694. Might not a certificate be given without raising any question by the parent at all?—If that certificate were that no child had attended whose parents objected.

20695. First of all that no child is excluded from school on religious grounds, and then that no child had received religious instruction to which his parents objected?—That is a very ambiguous mode of putting it. I have no objection to this, which I think ought to answer every reasonable purpose,—that is, that the parent had full means of being acquainted with the religious instruction that was being given before he sent the child, that it was the belief of the manager that he was acquainted with it, and that he did not detain him one day longer than his parent approved of his remaining.

20696. Sir Robert Esau.—Your lordship's view is that a parent who sends his child to the school must be taken as acquiescing in the religious instruction which he is furnished the child would receive?—That is my view.

The Very  
Rev. William  
Athens, D.D.

The Very Rev. WILLIAM ATHENS, D.D., Dean of Ferns, sworn and examined.

20697. The Chairman.—Are you a supporter of the National system of education?—Yes.

20698. Are you yourself a patron or manager of any school?—Not at present, not during the last six years.

20699. Were you formerly?—Yes, for many years in the North of Ireland, in the parish of Ranelagh, where I was rector for eighteen and a half years. I had two schools under the National Board.

20700. Have you care of souls in your present parish?—Yes. I have a very large parish, and there are National Board schools in it, but not under my patronage.

20701. Under what patronage?—There is a convent school in which there are 262 children, and not a Protestant; and a National Board school in one of the outlying townlands, at which there is an average of fifty or fifty Roman Catholic children, and two Protestants attend it.

20702. What is the population of your parish?—

The Church population is 1,152—members of the Church of England—that is under my immediate charge. I have a district curacy separate which contains about 300 more.

20703. To what primary school do the Church children in your parish go?—To a school under the Board of Erasmus Smith, which is no expense whatever to the parish, all is paid by the Board of Erasmus Smith, to an infant school supported by voluntary subscriptions, and a Church Education school supported chiefly by Lord Courtenay.

20704. Is the Erasmus Smith school a primary school?—It is.

20705. What number of children attend it?—The average for the year that will shortly close, for the boys, will produce thirty-two; for the girls, twenty-five; and the infant school, which is in the same building, but supported by voluntary subscriptions, will have an average of about twenty-five.

20706. Are the Erasmus Smith schools efficient

and satisfactory to you?—They are not equal to the National schools of which I had experience.

20705. Do you consider that the Government maintain sufficient inspection?—Hardly. They examine very carefully twice a year—one examination, the time being appointed for it, and the other an examination as it were by surprise, but we generally know the month within which it will come.

20706. Do you take much part in the teaching or management of the Erasmus Smith schools?—I do; I am at least twice a week there, and my course is there twice or three times a very week.

20707. Do you give religious instruction yourself?—Not myself, but I examine a class now and then. I have adopted the system, and prefer it, of sitting down, and requiring the teacher to instruct in my presence.

20708. Are there any suggestions you would offer to the Commission for making the Erasmus Smith schools more efficient?—Yes, in all schools, and especially in the Erasmus Smith schools, the reading is not sufficiently attended to. Just before I came up, I went through my Erasmus Smith schools, and I found that, though the children were remarkably well prepared in geography and the details of grammar, there was not a child in the school that had not some trouble in reading; reading was not comfortable to him. You could not get a child so practised that he could take up a passage of a newspaper at home and read it. I think that is a great fault in all our Irish schools. And then another suggestion that applies to all schools that I have seen, which was once made to me by a visitor who came to my school—a medical man—is this. He said:—“You are always teaching your children the map of Ireland,—the Map of Ireland is exhibited in all the schools—you have it—and your children are led to think that Ireland is a great country. I never see a map of the United Isles, of the British Isles, and every child, naturally by the teacher's inclination, is led this way to magnify his own country, but it would be very useful to have a map to show that Ireland is a small country compared with England and Scotland.” I was so struck with the remark, I wrote to Bette for their interrogatory map list, and they had not such a thing as a map of the British Isles. The National Board have a map of the British Isles, but it is the least used. You will see that England, Ireland, and Scotland, are taught to the pupils separately, and the children in the schools, if I may say so, are never taught the relative magnitudes of Ireland compared with the rest of the British Isles, and they become better acquainted, of course very partially, with the towns and countries and rivers of their own island. Ireland is very striking in the map of the National Board, and Bette's interrogatory map when on the same scale as England.

20709. Would you suggest any alteration in the constitution of the Erasmus Smith Board, or the administration of its funds?—No; I am not well enough acquainted with their details.

20710. In your former parish in the North, where you were patron of a National school, was there much schism of religion amongst the children?—Yes, in all the schools, and there were a great many. I had a large parish. We had National schools in every diocese. I had two myself. There was one—a peculiar one—for which there was a grant from the Robertson School Committee, which produced £11 a year, and £2 a year for books. This was left under the will of Colonel Robertson. I got that school in connection with the National Board, with the help of Archbishop Gould and other clergymen, and then we got an efficient school. It might form a suggestion that there are many schools for which the bequests are too small, and these schools are managed, perhaps, under the views of the patrons of the schools as to what the terms of the will are. It was a long time thought that the will under which the grant was made for Colonel Robertson's schools confined it exclusively to schools under the Kildare-place Society. At length I got the schools recognised under the National Board, and connected them.

20711. Had you many Roman Catholics or Presbyterians in the schools of which you were patron?—Yes. When I left I had seventeen Roman Catholics attending in the female school. The Presbyterians had a good number of Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholics had some Protestants. I never knew a district in which the National system was more efficiently worked. In the town and neighbourhood of Ranelagh I found the shopkeepers of the different denominations mixed with one another; there was friendly intercourse. But in the town of Gorey, in which there is a convent school and an Erasmus Smith school, no Roman Catholic—I speak of the shopkeepers and the large class of farmers—will mix with the Protestants, and no Protestant with the Catholics, except in the way of business; and in the North of Ireland I found it of use to open a small news-room, to which all classes went to read the papers together and assemble together. In the town of Gorey—the principal landlord is a Roman Catholic, Mr. Ram. He and Mr. Vesey, a Protestant, and myself tried to get up a news-room, and could not do so. The different classes would not condescend.

20712. Sir Robert Keene.—In speaking of the predestination of the map of Ireland on the walls of the National schools, I presume you do not mean to underestimate the importance of the natives of Ireland being made familiar with the geographical circumstances of Ireland, the names of the rivers, and the principal cities?—No, not at all; but one of the things they ought to know is its relative size compared with England and Scotland, which the single map does not convey to them.

20713. All you mean to imply is that the child in addition to being made thoroughly conversant with the geography of his native land, should also be made aware of the relative position which that country holds geographically to the neighbouring countries?—Certainly.

20714. So that the position of Ireland, as one of the group of British islands, of which I believe there are altogether about 560, should be clearly understood?—Exactly.

20715. But you did not, in any way, mean to say that an Irishman should not be educated in the geography of his country?—I hope I did not convey that. I certainly did not intend to do so.

20716. The place in the North of Ireland you mentioned, and with which you were connected—Ranelagh—that is in the county of Donegal?—In the county of Donegal.

20717. When you were so successful in getting up a news-room, and getting the different classes to meet together there, did you find that adherents took place on perfectly equal terms—terms of social and religious equality?—Most perfect.

20718. No idea of domination on the part of one sect or another?—Not the smallest, unless the dominant party was represented by Father O'Donnell who was particularly fond of reading the Times when first it came in. I could name the different parties—the labour and grocers, who were Roman Catholics—coming in and looking at the newspapers. The newspapers formed, in fact, a pleasant, and, in my view, an opportunity of useful intercourse.

20719. In that locality had you many Church Education Society's schools?—Yes, on Mr. Hart's property at Glinalta, about four miles outside of the town. I had at first one of my schools under the Ladies' Bazaar School Society, which was managed on the Church Education plan, but that school I transferred to the National Board.

20720. Now, as to the attendance of the Church Education Society's schools, did it include any Roman Catholics?—Yes, always.

20721. How do you think was the attendance of Roman Catholics at that Church Education school obtained?—Was it perfectly voluntary on the part of the parents of those children?—Yes; the school was convenient. The female school of which you are asking me, the one under the Church Education

Dec 2, 1868.

The Very Rev. William Athol, D.D.

Dec. 2, 1898  
The Very  
Rev. William  
Adams, D.D.

Society, was a school for young girls—I could not call it an infant school; at the school under the Ladies' Bazaar Society there were much younger children.

20724. But the school on Mr. Hart's property under the Church Education Society?—There were some Roman Catholics in it. It was in a very wild district, and there was no school within three miles of it.

20725. And your attention was not called to any unpleasantness arising from the presence of Roman Catholics?—No; I never had a case of the kind occurring.

20726. Do you find in the part of the country with which you are connected—the classes with which you mix—any decided wish expressed for the establishment of a denominational system on earth distinguished from the present system of the National Board?—Not in the North of Ireland. I think that some of the landlords were in favour of the denominational system. Many regarded the Church Education Society as the best. One landlord particularly, in the North of Ireland, thought so much he saw a Presbyterian school that was about three or four miles out of the town of Ramelton, to which he had been induced to give a subscription of £20, and which was a very successful school; after that he took part with me in putting a school that was in the town of Ramelton, under the National Board.

20727. On the whole, then, your experience of the working of the National Board system in the parts of the country with which you have been connected is, that practically it has been of service?—Practically it has been of service and successful, and is well adapted to the wants of the country. I think, so far as we can say of any system, that is to a certain degree a compromise, as far as any system can be perfect, I think the National Board system in Ireland is so.

20728. With regard to the system of inspection, do you consider it would be of practical advantage to have a system of inspection rendered strictly denominational?—Under the National Board?

20729. Under the National Board?—I think not. I have never considered the question.

20730. As long as the system itself is not denominational the power of inspection is not required to be denominational?—I think not.

20731. Mr. Gibson.—Have you ever made any application to the Board of Education for such maps as you thought were necessary for interesting your children other than those you have mentioned?—I have got them myself for my school. I mean to say they are not generally used through the National Board schools. You will see the map of the British Isles occurs in the last only once. The National Board have three or four sets which they offer to you, and in those the map of the British Isles occurs only in the one set, and is the most expensive. I think a map of the British Isles will cost five or six shillings; a map of Ireland, with the little companion book, is only one shilling and sixpence, and as we look after economy, we buy the three maps of England, Ireland, and Scotland, for five shillings and sixpence, which is cheaper than the map of the British Isles.

20732. Don't you think a map of Europe much more satisfactory than merely a map of the British Isles?—Yes; but a gentleman undertaking to get his pupils ready for the next inspection out of the map of Europe would make an indifferent exhibition.

20733. You gave us an objection generally to the system that it had no map of the British Isles?—That would not be true. They have one map of the British Isles, but I say in the circumstances of their school supply it is so managed that it is a different map to get.

20734. Mr. Stokes.—Have you examined in geography many children in National schools?—I have.

20735. And have you found them well acquainted with the geography of Ireland?—Remarkably well.

20736. Do you not think that the best evidence they could give of their being well taught in geography is, that they knew well the geography of their native

land?—Decidedly. This is not what I complain of, but the fact I complain of is, that Ireland is not shown to be relatively much smaller than England and Scotland. The matter has, of course, occurred by accident. I never might have remarked it myself except that my attention was turned to it by a visitor. I did not think the remark as an original one, but, on the contrary, that it was made to me by another.

20737. In the degraded condition of the people of this country don't you think it a good thing that their self-respect should be increased even by an exaggerated notion of the importance of their own country?—Certainly not. I don't think by any exaggeration that should be done.

20738. Mr. Swetten.—Would not the map of Europe be quite sufficient to give them that idea of relationship?—Yes; better than nothing, but when we have so good a one of the British Isles why not avail ourselves of it?

20739. Would the map of the British Isles make them as well acquainted with the rivers and towns of Ireland as a map of Ireland?—It would not.

20740. Therefore you would have four instead of three?—I think I would have a map of the British Isles and a map of Ireland.

20741. Are you acquainted with the systems of teaching geography in the Prussian schools?—I am not.

20742. And that they there confine themselves to the particular province the child lives in?—That may have been the case under Prussia, but not after they have been all united—after they become united Germany.

20743. Bishop of Meath.—Of course you are aware that the present system of National education is not acceptable to the great mass of the clergy in this country, whether belonging to the Established Church or to the Roman Catholic?—I am, and I lament it very much.

20744. Have you thought over any scheme by which the present system might be modified in such a way as to meet the views of both these bodies?—I have.

20745. Would you state it?—The question must divide itself into two branches. Is the National system, as such, to be continued? or am we to have a total change? If we are to have a total change, it may then be asked what would be the change most desirable. I would say, let the State concern itself only with secular education, and let it not interfere at all about religious education. Perhaps I adopt that view for reasons different from those of others. I adopt it on the firm belief that in ten or eleven years the National system would result from our long list free.

20746. You would allow the patron of each school to manage the school as he thought fit?—As he thought fit, and the State to interfere with the secular instruction only.

20747. And how would the attainments of the children and of the schoolmasters be ascertained?—By the same system as the present National Board adopts—by the Inspectors dropping round, and seeing the classes all right, and making examinations, together with examinations at an appointed time.

20748. Have you discussed that scheme extensively with other persons?—With one or two, and found it approved of by both sides. I spoke to some leading Church Education people who I think approve of it, but some National Board men objected more than Church Education men.

20749. On what ground?—That they think the National system should not be interfered with at all. They prefer the system in its present state. To return to the former point. If the National system is to continue, some plan should be devised to give it fixity, you should have as long as a Board of Commissioners. In country districts the impression amongst the clergyman is, that some day or other the National Board will be changed in a way to embrace Church Education schools; and many parties think that these who put schools under the system will find themselves disappointed by changes introduced by the Commissioners.

20750. You think that the constitution of the

Dec. 2, 1869  
—  
The Very  
Rev. William  
Atkins, D.D.

Board ought to be changed!—Not the constitution. I would put it into the hands of a smaller executive, and give it the same fixed and determinate form that the English system has. They don't expect any changes in England without going through the process of a revised code. It would be a great benefit to our Irish system if it was managed in the same way.

20751. Lord Clarendon.—Would the same system that you propose as a change in the National system, that of allowing every person to have religious instruction as he pleases—would not that be diverting the system into a denominational one?—I think it would, at first, but there is a tendency with us all, when we are left free to work, towards the National Board system, the common system, and those different changes which we see every day. If you allow me I will give you one or two examples of our doing so in Ireland when we were left free. There is the good example of Trinity College. That institution was placed under the direction and management of Protestant Fellows, and if left to their own inclination, as they started, they never would have a Roman Catholic in it, but as the system worked on they did admit them. Any person might enter the college, Roman Catholic or Dissenter, without being obliged to receive religious instruction; then they opened their Scholarships to Roman Catholics, and I have no doubt, if left free, they will open their Fellowships to them. Let me give you another example. I could call to the mind of the Lord Bishop of Meath a large public school in Cork, which was a private school conducted by two gentlemen. The Protestant came once a week, and the Protestants assembled in a separate room, and had religious instruction for an hour or two. The Roman Catholic priest came to the same school. Mr. Hamilton and Dr. Porter, who conducted the school, were both Protestants, and many of the parents of the children were Protestants, and these never was an objection to the religious system of the school. The numbers attending were eighty or ninety. They had the children separate for religious instruction, and they received together their secular instruction. Again, there is the Killybegs place Society. I think that unfortunately in Ireland the State interfered about ten years too soon on the subject of education. The Killybegs place Society had so far advanced that it sent an immense number of Roman Catholic teachers throughout the country, and if a Roman Catholic child refused to read the Authorized Version of the Scriptures in the schools of that society, he was allowed to read the Douay Version. I mention these things to show that, if we are left free to ourselves on the subject of education, we are not so bad as we are represented to be. There is a tendency to meet the feelings of the parents of the children; and in the Catholic University, I think, it has been observed in one of the speeches of a former President that they had a method student, a Church of England man, and that his religious tenets were never interfered with. Am I correct in stating that? I only venture to state it from memory.

20752. If a Protestant patron was allowed to give whatever religious instruction he pleased, and how he pleased, do you think Roman Catholic parents would be willing to entrust their children to such a school or to be educated in such a school?—I do. We are apt to take a scientific and refined view of the whole question, that very often never reaches the mind of the country people. I remember asking a person one day "Why do you send your child to my school?" and the answer I received was: "Your master teaches writing and cyphering better than the other masters." Motives of that kind weigh with them, and they send their children to the school to see how they will get on. They have motives and objects we cannot see. Suppose, under the system I advocate, a Roman Catholic sends his child under somewhat such motives for a time to a Protestant school, and suppose at first that child is compelled, each day, to read a chapter of the Bible, the parent after a while hears of this, and begins to think that he purchases the good reading, and writing, and cyphering too

clearly, and comes to the master and says, "I don't require my child to be taught your religion." The master refers that to the patron, and the patron says, you must not force, you must not compel that child to read the Scriptures. I have known that to be the result even in Church Education Society schools—that sooner than let the child go away for a fortnight or so, the child would be excused for the time from reading the Bible.

20753. That would be only a negative advantage to the parent that the child would not be proselytized. But suppose that parent wishes a child to have religious instruction, how would you provide for that?—That would be always a difficulty on both sides.

20754. Your opinion is that the system would ultimately work back to the present system of mixed education?—That is my opinion.

20755. Mr. Justice Austin.—Whether are you in favour of this total change, that the State should be only concerned about the secular education and leaving the religious instruction to the manager or patron, or the present, with the improvements that are suggested by having fixed rules, which the Commissioners only discuss?—The National Board with some changes. I have as yet mentioned only one sixty and paid Commissioner for the carrying out of that. If I may go on with the evidence I offer, I would add two points more. The Poor Law Guardians ought to be empowered, in districts where there are no National schools under his patronage, or under clerical patronage, to set up a National school. If a village is in a very bad sanitary state, if it is very badly drained, the Poor Law Guardians have power to drain the streets, and clean things left uncared by the inhabitants. I know a case where the Poor Law Guardians used the poor-rate for that purpose, and the Commissioners have approved of it. It does sometimes happen that, through the negligence of the people, there are districts left without schools to meet the wants of the people that are there, and I think that the National Board, in conjunction with the Poor Law Commissioners, should have power to build a school in those districts, and that the religious instruction in those schools should be under the care of the chaplains of the workhouses. The chaplain of the workhouse is bound to go there once a week, and go there on Sundays also, to visit and look after the religious instruction of his people, and the denominational system is adopted there. I am chaplain of the workhouse in Garry. I never knew of the Catholic or Presbyterian chaplain to interfere with my own people, and if the same system was allowed, as regards the schools, the same chaplains should go out and attend to the religious instruction of the children. I think that is a system that is wanted, and would be a great improvement in the National system. It would absorb a great many of our small schools where there are only seven or eight children attending, and which are denominational schools at present, as there are only a few Roman Catholics in the district, or a few Protestants, as the case may be. Another addition to the National Board system I would be inclined to recommend for adoption in Ireland is a system which has been acted on in England partly. I think it is called Miss Bardsley Count's system—small schools united under one paid teacher. Suppose there are five or six schools with small averages from ten to twenty (and there are large districts in Ireland where the attendance does not average over thirty), the schools in that case ought to be looked after upon the English system. That system is, that a first class master is appointed, and is paid £100 a year, and his duty is to go to each of those schools for three hours in every week; the teachers and mistresses of those schools are only like monitors under him. He appoints the lessons, and sees that they are learned when he comes next. Our great difficulty is to get a set of small schools, especially in the South of Ireland, to have an average number enough to get a master. I think small schools might be grouped together. I am sure if there were any with an average even of six or seven it would be an advantage if the Board grouped

Dec 2, 1868.

The Very  
Rev. William  
Adkins, &c

them and appointed an efficient master over them. I believe all schools of that class are denominational. Many of them are Church Education schools as well as Roman Catholic; some of them are Presbyterian.

20754. *Master Steele*—You mean a circulating master?—A circulating master. It is an admirable system, and perhaps it would be no harm to leave the religious education free. If the National Board became fixed, and if the National Board were supplemented by this kind of workhouse schools, and this kind of grouped schools, I would then prefer the National Board system. There are, besides, what I would call small modifications of the National system, but if those important changes are not to be carried out I say let the State concern itself with secular education only.

20755. *Mr Justice Morris*—Are you aware that you are in a very considerable minority amongst clergymen of your own Church in preferring the National system, even with its modifications to the other system of where the State would be only concerned about secular education?—I am in a surprising minority. I am the only clergyman favouring the National system in the diocese of Ferns. I don't know of any other one.

20756. Are you aware that so far as can be calculated the Roman Catholic clergy and the bishops, and members of that Church are, I may say so, in favour of the system in which the State should be only concerned, in secular education, and not interfere with the religious?—I am. I have heard generally they would prefer it. I have not spoken much to any of them, and so I differ so much from the brethren of my Church I have only spoken to a few of them.

20757. How do you think, no matter how freely you may think your own opinion is right, or you may be of opinion the system can practically work with all the teachers of the great majority of the people in the diocese of Ferns, differing from it, and the teachers of all your own denomination, except yourself—how do you think your system can work in antagonism with all the clergy of your own faith? I am now speaking of the clergy of your own neighbourhood, in the diocese of Ferns, you look that yourself as the illustration of the small minority?—You asked me about comparing my opinion with the clergy in the neighbourhood. I cannot compare my opinion with the clergy living all through Ireland.

20758. You are aware the clergy living all through Ireland who are in favour of the mixed system of education, which excludes religious instruction, are a very small minority?—I am not aware of that. As regards this system of letting the State concern itself with secular education alone, I have no reason to say yes or no for them; but I think the Church Education Society would accept it.

20759. I am asking you about those who approve of the National system—namely, of a mixed system of education in which religious instruction is not to be a portion of the education. Are you aware the clergy of your Church who approve of the National system are a very small minority?—I am.

20760. Has not the National system, from its first establishment, been rather dragging towards a denominational system?—I think not. I tell you my reason. At first sight it appears dragging towards it; but when you take the returns each year of the attendance at the National schools, and solve the problem of how many Protestant children in National schools mix with Roman Catholics, and calculating the fraction that represents that, and then in the same districts calculating the fraction that represents at the last census how many Protestants there are compared with the Roman Catholics, the weakness of the results is astonishing. You must have seen it in the last report of the Commissioners. I think it is 49 in the one case and 51 in the other. Suppose Limerick was taken, and that the fraction represents Protestants in Limerick to Roman Catholics in Limerick, or suppose that for certain districts we have the fraction, 32. Take in the National Board schools in the same districts the proportion of Protestants and Roman Catholics

attending mixed schools—schools in which Protestants and Roman Catholics are combined—and the fraction would come out as close as possible, which seems a most satisfactory proof that where Protestants and Roman Catholics are mixed in a district, there the National school system has been successful in mixing them, and mixing them in the proportion which you would expect from the census returns.

20761. *Mr Jones*—When there happen to be two schools in the same district in the one immediate neighbourhood—both being National schools, but one under the management of and taught by members of the Established Church, and the other under Roman Catholic teaching and management—is it your experience that there is any great admixture of religious denominations amongst the children attending those schools?—There is a mixture; but if the schools are within the one district—if the children live so that they could go to either of the schools—if the Protestant has his school, and the Catholic his school—the tendency would be to go to the school taught by the members of their own persuasion—the Catholics, for example, to the Catholic, and the Protestants to the Protestant school. But, nevertheless, so much do the parents depend on the fairness of the National system, that Protestants within the National school district will in some numbers, but not in the exact proportion of the census, go to the Roman Catholic school. I know of a case myself in which I have advised the parents to send their children to the Roman Catholic school—to a school that was under the priest—rather than send them two miles to the Protestant school. I knew the two or three children would be fairly treated—that they would receive the same secular instruction; and I could quite depend that their religious principles would not be interfered with. No doubt they would be obliged to submit to be called nicknames, but not more than are given in any other public school.

20762. Is it not your experience that where there is a choice between schools people will choose as teachers for their children persons of their own religious persuasion?—Certainly.

20763. *Rev. Dr. Wilson*—Though you belong to a small minority of the clergy of the Established Church approving of the National system of education, may I ask is the number of the clergy in favour of such a system increasing or otherwise?—I think increasing in favour of the National Board.

20764. From your experience in both the North and South of Ireland, can you say is the number of the laity in favour of the National system on the increase or otherwise?—On the increase certainly.

20765. To any extent?—I think so.

20766. Have you turned your attention to the reports of the Church Education Society?—I have very often looked at them.

20767. Do you find the attendance of children in the schools of the Church Education Society on the increase or otherwise?—The attendance is diminishing as well as I remember, but I should not take it upon myself to answer that accurately. I will make one remark on the Church Education schools—namely, that the Roman Catholic children who come to them are taken away at an earlier age than the Roman Catholic children are taken away from the National Board schools.

20768. You say that if a change is to be made in the system of education, you prefer it should be secular, should you say that no religious instruction in that case should be given in any of the schools?—By whom?

20769. By any parties?—In Ireland I am quite sure religious instruction will be given every day. We are a religious people. There is no probability of an infidel school being set up in Ireland. In England they are obliged to protect themselves on that point. What a school is not connected with some religious society, they require that the Authorized Version should be read. I don't think it would be well to compromise our system by putting any such clause as that for Ireland. I don't think it would be understood



20772. Would you contemplate religious instruction being given either daily or weekly in the schools?—I am quite sure it would be given every day all through Ireland. Certainly in the Church schools, and I am sure the Roman Catholics would give it every day.

20773. Is it in connexion with the non-vested system you have the secular system you refer to in view?—With respect to all, I would say that the non-vested, vested, and Church Education schools all through Ireland. Let the State concern itself only with secular education. I suppose every National Board school, under what I suggest, would continue as now, with the exception that all rules about religious instruction would be cleared out of them. The secular departments should continue as they are now.

20774. Practically, according to your experience both North and South, do the parents desire secular instruction for the children for its own sake, irrespective of religious?—Certainly, and that feeling is growing more and more in Ireland.

20775. Now, having passed, as I did a short time since, a National school which was closed by the manager, a Roman Catholic gentleman, should you be surprised to learn that in that case the Roman Catholic children freely went to a Protestant school at some distance to receive their education?—Not at all.

20776. Although in that case they should be required to read the Authorized Version of the Scriptures daily?—It would not surprise me. It is a proof that the parents do value secular instruction, because they do not send their children there for the sake of religious instruction.

20777. Master Brooke.—You remember the Lord Primate's letter of 1869?—I do.

20778. In which he said he wished every clergyman in his diocese would have a Church Education school, and that if the circumstances were such as that he could not sufficiently support it, then he thought they might safely and properly resort to the National Board.—That was the purport of his letter; I think?—Yes.

20779. In finding an increase in the number of clergy taking assistance from the National Board, do you not think it is owing to the principle, "My poverty and not my will consents"?—I do not.

20780. You don't know any instance of the sort?—I do not.

20781. You think there is no one who joined the Board since 1860 who was driven to it in that way?—I do not, and I would be very sorry to know any such case.

20782. The Chairman.—In the case of the school you spoke of at Cork, at which you were educated, and in which there were a number of Roman Catholic pupils, were the pupils boarders, or exclusively day boys?—Some were boarders. They were chiefly day boys, however. Baron Derry was one. We formed a friendship in our school class and continued it in Trinity College. I knew Judge Keogh very well. He continued friendly and intimate, and lately in College, meeting my son, introduced him to his son, and handed down the friendship. I mention this as a proof that dissenting boys of different denominations together do really produce some benefit in Ireland.

20783. Do you know many laymen who were formerly patrons of Church Education schools who now support the National Board?—I know two. The question has been so warm a one in Ireland I don't think many of the gentry have changed sides on it.

20784. Are the younger clergy—those who have been ordained within the last few years—are they more favourable to the National Board than the old ones?—I am sure they are.

20785. Are there many of the younger clergy, so far as your knowledge goes, who are strong advocates of the Church Education Society?—There are some very strong advocates of the society amongst them.

20786. Should you say that amongst the younger clergy the two parties are evenly balanced, or on which side do you suppose the numbers preponderate?—I think they are now evenly balanced, but about ten

years ago the excess in favour of the Church Education Society was three or four to one.

20787. Have you ever had anything to do with model schools?—Occasionally, visiting the Londonderry model school. I was examining chaplains to Dr. Higin, the late Bishop of Derry. I used to reside at the palace at various periods of the year, then I used to go to the model school constantly. That leads me to suggest one thing with respect to model schools. There was a class of pupils attending that I was anxious to see there. One was the Mayor of Derry's son, another was a wealthy merchant's, and the sons of other most successful people well able to pay £10 or £20 a year for the education of their sons. I saw the son of a great distiller there. I thought it very wrong.

20788. What is your opinion of the Londonderry Model School, as a place for training teachers?—I think it is a very good.

20789. At the time you speak of had it a full complement of pupil teachers, or teachers in training within its walls?—It had, I think.

20790. Were there any Roman Catholics amongst them?—Very few, I think, when I left. I don't think there were more than six or seven, even at the model school itself, Roman Catholics. When I left Derry the attendance was very large; but, as a mixed school, it had disappointed.

20791. Was that from the absence of a Roman Catholic population, or did the Roman Catholics go elsewhere?—It was opposed strongly by the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese.

20792. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What is the date to which you refer?—1861, and of 1862 I was removed to Gurcy, in the county of Wexford.

20793. Mr. Stoker.—Do you remember what proportion of the population of Derry is Roman Catholic?—I do not.

20794. Is it not 56 per cent?—I should think so. Within the walls of Derry, Church of England Protestants are remarkably few. I don't suppose there are 500 Church of England men within what you would call the city of Derry. There are a great many in the neighbourhood in villages, occupying country places, but as to Derry, and the localities likely to supply pupils to the model school, there are few Episcopalians, a great many Presbyterians in the town, and Roman Catholics.

20795. The Chairman.—Do you deem, following the analogy of the English system, that any changes made from time to time in the proposed regulations of the Board of National Education should be laid before both Houses of Parliament for a specific period before they came into operation?—Certainly; it would be one of the greatest blessings possible for Ireland, no matter what system is adopted after the report of the Commission, whatever it may be, if we were to have fifty, even if it were proposed as an experiment for four or five years, giving us a certain space of time within which changes should not be made in the system.

20796. Mr. Sullivan.—Is it not that very elasticity that enabled the system to endure for thirty years?—I think there was one change to the non-vested system that had a beneficial effect.

20797. Do you believe that the National system would have existed for thirty years if every change in the rules had, in the first instance, to be laid before Parliament?—I think it would, and that it would have succeeded better after the non-vested system was introduced. That was the great turning point. It was that that led the Presbyterians to join the Board. You have now no idea or perhaps have no information as to this Commission of the little meetings held in country districts on this subject—half-a-dozen in favour of the National Board, half-a-dozen of the Church Education people meeting together and then going to the National Board. I was twice on deputations myself. One had no more weight in its object than this, that instead of the notice being, "This is the hour of religious instruction," the suggestion made was, and one in favour of which I voted myself, that the notice should be, "All children present are

Dec. 3, 1869.

The Very Rev. William Ashurst, &c.

Dec. 2, 1888.  
The Very  
Rev. William  
Atkins, D.D.

requested to receive the religious instruction that is now offered." That would appear to a great many as if it would relieve their consciences by having inducted the children to receive religious instruction often.

206798. Did the Board sanction that change?—They debated it for a week or a fortnight and then rejected it. It would be a great deal better to have nothing of the kind occurring.

206799. You say the turning point of the system was the admission of the Presbyterians; are you aware that that was the turning point or change that alienated the Roman Catholics who formed the large majority in the country—that they were alienated by the very changes that admitted the Presbyterians?—Is that the fact that the Roman Catholics were alienated? Is there not a very proportion of Roman Catholics under the system?

206800. Are they quite satisfied with the system?—Not on that point I think, but I should say that the Roman Catholics are not dissatisfied with it from the number of children attending the schools, but they are dissatisfied with what appears to be partly reasonable enough, that they are not allowed full permission to teach their religion in the way they like—a similar complaint to that of the Church Education Society. Both complain very much.

206801. That is to say they accept the present system in lieu of a better system?—Yes.

206802. With regard to the Cork school you spoke of, is it not several years since a large number of Roman Catholics were in that school?—It was when I was a school-boy, I think I left it in 1830.

206803. Has the number of Roman Catholics in attendance in it declined?—I am aware that Mr. Haselin did not many years ago.

206804. Were there many Roman Catholics in it after that?—I am not aware.

206805. When there were a great number of Roman Catholics in it were there good Roman Catholic schools to which the Roman Catholics could go?—Yes, two schools, one under Mr. Finerty, and there was another, in both of which classes were taught.

206806. Were they very superior schools?—Mr. Finerty's was a very good school.

206807. Was it an exclusively Roman Catholic school?—Well, I was never at it.

206808. Were there not Protestants at it?—There were. The Bennetts I remember went at it. All these were private venture schools, and the desire to have so many scholars as possible introduced the National system.

206809. They had no religious aspect whatever?—They had not, but they were not purely secular, for we had our own religion taught.

206810. In Finerty's school, for example?—I don't know. There was another school in Cork, a celebrated mathematical school, under Mr. Malachy, a Roman Catholic, I was a pupil. It was this unhappy controversy about the National Board put us all on our sharps.

206811. Before this controversy arose, and so soon as Roman Catholics got schools of their own, did they not send their children to them?—They did.

206812. If they had them at the time of the schools you mention, would they not have done the same?—I

think so. That does not in any way interfere with the principles I had down.

206813. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—To what changes do you refer as having given satisfaction to the Presbyterians?—I thought—perhaps I may not be accurate—I thought that at first the National Board was assisting schools called vested schools only. After some time they acceded to remonstrances, and introduced what was called the non-vested system, as I remember that was the turning point.

206814. Could you say at what time?—I could not.

206815. Do you think it was to meet the views of the Presbyterians?—I think it was.

206816. Are you aware that Dr. Doyle had in his diocese a number of parochial schools under the clergy of his own Church, which originated the non-vested system as early as 1832? Have you read his circular in 1831?—I dare say I did, but I don't remember.

206817. Should you modify your opinion if you read the following minutes of the Board of Education, at a meeting where Roman Catholic Commissioners were present, and where, upon reference to the action of the Presbyterians in 1840, it is stated, "It may be observed that the practice as to religious instruction in the Presbyterian schools is in substance, *essentia* *stantia*, similar to that in many schools under the direction of Roman Catholics?" and that "At a conference between the Commissioners and the gentlemen of the Synod of Ulster and the Lord Lieutenant, it was neither proposed nor limited at that time should be any change in the rules of the Board?" Should that statement modify your opinion that the change was made to meet the views of the Presbyterians?—Well, I am not sure it would. I was speaking on a subject on which I had not refreshed my memory for years, but it is not an admitted fact that that was the occasion on which the Presbyterians joined? That was what I meant to convey, and I should be surprised if that was not accurate.

206818. Personally are you acquainted with this part of the history of the system?—I am not.

206819. Mr. Stoker.—As a friend of the National Board, do you propose to repeal all the rules affecting religious instruction?—All the rules.

206820. Would you leave the managers as free in the choice of their books as you would leave them in the choice of their religious instruction?—I think I would.

206821. Do you contemplate a system of separate training for young masters and mistresses?—No. I would still keep the different model schools available for training in the country just as now. They have their separate religious instruction.

206822. In freeing ordinary schools from restrictions with regard to religious instruction, would you maintain the training schools as mixed?—Yes, that would be absolutely necessary, unless you intended to send out secular instructors only, without any teaching of religion.

206823. If you left the training of masters and mistresses free, do you not think the people of this country would sort themselves into denominations and support various training schools?—I think they would for a time, but the National system is the true result, and will of itself result, if we are left a little more free to get at it.

The Very  
Rev. William  
Warrington,  
D.D.

The Very Rev. WILLIAM WARRINGTON, D.D., Dean of Elphin, sworn and examined

206824. The Chairman.—Where do you reside?—At Elphin.

206825. Have you a parish and cure of souls attached to your deanery?—Yes.

206826. Are you manager of any school under the Board there?—Yes. I am manager of a boys' school, and I had one in the county of Kildare, before I came into Elphin. I have been upwards of twenty years manager of National schools.

206827. What number of children usually attend the school at Elphin, of which you are manager?—There

are generally upon the roll from one hundred to eighty, and for many years the average attendance has not gone down lower than fifty-two. It has been up to sixty-five.

206828. Of those eighty or one hundred children on the rolls, what proportion have been Protestants?—At present there are about eight Protestants. Sometimes the number varied by accidental circumstances, a Protestant police constable, with a large family, would be stationed at Elphin, and there would in consequence be a larger proportion of Protestant pupils.

20829. Is there any other National school in the place under Roman Catholic management?—There is 20830. Is that an ordinary National school?—

Yes.

20831. Who is the patron?—The parish priest.

20832. Do Roman Catholics go indifferently to your school and to his?—I think they go in greater numbers to your school.

20833. Is his school in the town?—Yes.

20834. Do they go to one school or other according to their estimate of the respective merits of the teachers?—I think so. When I say I think so many of them go to the Roman Catholic school probably because it is under the Roman Catholic clergyman, naturally enough, but I think that I have generally a greater number than they have.

20835. Has there ever been any considerable opposition on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy to Roman Catholic children coming to your school?—When the present bishop, Dr. Gibbony, was first appointed to the diocese of Elphin he did denounce my school, but, I must say, he did it in a very fair manner. He said, as I was informed, that he would not object to me as an individual, that he was convinced I acted uprightly and honourably in the matter, but that he had an objection to any school of which the patron was a Protestant. I must add I did not hear him say this, but that is the report I heard, and he did forbid the children to come to my school.

20836. Did that result in the diminution of the children for the time?—I do not think I lost one.

20837. Did any disagreement arise between you and the Roman Catholic clergy as to the teaching and management of these schools?—Never, the slightest, but this I must say for the Roman Catholic clergy, they knew I carried out the principle of the system speedily and honourably. I have no doubt that if I had trifled upon it there would have been a disagreement.

20838. Were you for the same years a member in support of the Church Education Society?—Never.

20839. You have been always a friend of the National system?—Yes, always, and before the National system was established I was always of opinion it was the only just and right system under which to conduct the education of the country.

20840. Are you satisfied with its practical working?—Perfectly, so far as my experience extends.

20841. Do you consider the system of inspection efficient?—I do; excellent, at the same time it is a system of inspection that might and does mislead many people; for instance, if an enemy to National schools were to take upon an Inspector's report he would say—"Oh, you see how this Inspector finds fault. These schools cannot be efficient." The fact is, the Inspector takes a very high idea of what a National school ought to be. They look for an amount of perfection that I don't think is attainable in the ordinary run of National schools. It is right they should be strict; and it is their duty to find fault, and they do it. It is very just and right they should find this fault, but I venture to say the National schools of England are very inferior in their results to the Irish schools. I went the year before last to the Continent for my health; I was walking with an American on the Alps. I was talking to him a good deal about Ireland and the Irish, and I asked him about the Irish emigrants. He told me the Irish emigrants were better educated than any others, and that they were very clever at keeping accounts, and wrote good hands. Many of them he said got on extremely well as superintendents of stores. I mention this because I think it is indirect testimony to the efficiency of our National schools, from a person who was impartial and competent, for he evidently appeared from his conversation to be a man of business, and likely to be informed on the subject. I don't say they cannot be improved. I am sure everything is capable of being improved, but I think there is a vast number of well-educated young men turned out by them. These young men go to other countries, and get on extremely well there in consequence of the

education they received in the National schools in this country.

20842. Do you think it would be a good thing if a portion of the schoolmaster's income depended on the proficiency of the children, according to the system known in England as payment by results?—I doubt it very much. I think it would lead to a system of what I call cramming—at the same time I don't speak positively about it, but I doubt of its being suited to this country.

20843. Do you not think some stimulus is wanting to make the schoolmaster push the children through the First and Second Books?—The schoolmasters have many difficulties to contend with, and require to be looked after; but, as a general rule, they attend very fairly, and are very anxious so far as I have seen to discharge their duties efficiently.

20844. Do you think it would be possible to graduate the lower classes in the schools, so that, as in England, in the lower classes, a child might be expected to rise from one class to another each year?—I have never considered it in that point of view, so I don't like to give an opinion. I have not reflected on the subject; but I certainly think they want a stimulus—not the masters only but also the pupils. In the first place, it is very difficult where children have other occupations to get them to attend continuously. Persons having a knowledge of children are aware that if a boy stays away from school one day he loses not only that day's education, but a certain power of application which spends over two or three days. Before I condemn the masters, the results of whose teaching are not very satisfactory, I would ascertain the nature of the attendance at their schools; for, if they cannot command the attendance, they cannot produce results.

20845. Has it ever occurred to you to look over the school rules, and see how long children have been in the school before getting a rise in classification?—I don't think I have done that. I have often looked over the books in reference to the attendance. I know the attendance is very irregular. If you compare the total number on the rolls in any school with the average attendance that fact will appear.

20846. Are the parents prone to keep the children at home from any frivolous excuse?—No; as a general rule the parents value education.

20847. Could you say what proportion of the children in your school pay school fees?—Very few indeed, but there was a reason for that. The bishop always resided at Elphin till I came. There was great liberality in keeping schools for children without requiring payment from them, and they got so habituated to it that they almost expected free education as a right, and they were very poor besides, because Elphin is one of those places in which there is what I call no landlord—the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are nominally the landlords; but there are, in many instances, landlords between them and the tenants. The town is very badly circumstanced in that respect, and there is no one to do almost anything.

20848. Do you encourage the schoolmasters to get school fees from the children whose parents are able to pay?—I desire him to charge anyone able to pay, but not to be strict in enforcing payment, because they are not accustomed to pay. Making them pay, I was afraid might have a bad effect.

20849. Do you think if it were deemed desirable to increase the salaries of schoolmasters the State might ask to have such an increase provided by an educational rate?—I think it ought to do so. Some years ago, I made a proposition to an eminent statesman in reference to this subject. Probably the time had not arrived for it then, but I think it has arrived now—that is, to have a compulsory rate for education. I would arrange it in such manner as to make the laity in the country take an interest in it. My proposition was, to have a certain educational rate. Let the Government make a grant equal to that rate. I would have this within the area of each union. I also proposed to have an educational committee selected, from the Poor Law Board of Guardians. There is always a good deal

Dec 2, 1863.

The Very Rev. William Warburton, D.D.

Dec 3, 1886

The Very  
Rev. William  
Warburton,  
D.D.

of energy, talent, and ability, I think, going to waste on those Boards, and I think that if they had their attention turned to the subject it would be of great benefit to the country. I propose that a committee consisting of the most intelligent men should be selected. Let the committee be three, four, five, or seven, or whatever number might be thought desirable. Let it be their duty to visit from time to time every school within the union. I would have them visit in such a way that the masters could never know when the visit would be made. For instance, if a member of the committee were passing by one of the schools, going to a fair, he would get down from his carriage and examine the school. I would have them make a report of the state of education in the district every year, and if they liked to suggest improvements well and good. I think by that means you would do what we want very much to effect, namely, interest the laity in education.

20850. Do you think that on the ordinary Boards of Guardians you would get a sufficient number of gentlemen to pay proper attention to a system of that sort?—I am sure that when they were suggested for the purpose you would. I don't think anyone would like to undertake the duty unless he was officially employed.

20851. Have you had experience of model schools?—I have not attended any model schools. I have a paper connected with a school that I am establishing in Elphin, which I think is the kind of school we want for Ireland. I intend it to be a first-class English school and to have a classical class.

20852. Is that school to be under the Board?—No, it is to be maintained by a bequest made by a Bishop Heddon. We built it under the Court of Chancery, by which the rules were sanctioned.

20853. Will this be an exclusively Protestant school?—No, the terms of the grant are that the school was to be for the benefit of the inhabitants of Elphin and for teaching such of them as are poor, gratis, it was some land left by Bishop Heddon, a bishop of the Established Church, a great many years ago. The land was encumbered, and let upon a long lease, I believe, with a fine. The lease fell out some years ago, and as soon as it did we brought it under the Court of Chancery, which sanctioned the rules that we are to apply in the working. We had to apply the funds, first to procure buildings. The buildings are finished, and just paid for, and we were going to appoint a master about twelve months ago, when my illness and other circumstances obliged us to postpone it. We are now appointing the master.

20854. Who are the trustees?—The trustees are the bishop, the dean, and chapter, and they have the oversight of the funds, but the school is for the benefit of the inhabitants of Elphin town and the teaching of the children of the poor.

20855. Who are the members of the chapter besides yourself?—The archdeacon, the precentor, and I think there are eight parsonages besides.

20856. Do these receive emoluments?—They receive no emoluments as governors of this institution, but the whole oversight of the funds is vested in them.

20857. Will the school be for boarders?—Our intention is to allow the master to have boarders on his private account if he likes.

20858. When is the school likely to be opened?—Advertisements for the master have been in the papers. I have now, I think, about twenty applications, which we are considering. We had a meeting about a fortnight ago, and we postponed investigating the claims of each master in order to get the very best man we can.

20859. Can you say whether the candidates are of different religions?—No, in fact the chapter will have him a layman of the Established Church. I may say more than that. I may as well mention the circumstances. I myself was very strongly in favour of placing it in connection with the National Board, but I was outvoted by a majority of six, owing to the ac-

cidental illness of one of the chapter, who was not able to take part with me. Still I hope to be able to do it, because I think a great deal of the success of the school would depend upon whether it was connected with the Board or not. I think myself these being a clerical manager the people might very naturally wish to have a material guarantee that we would not interfere with the religion of the pupils, though it was not our intention under any circumstances to interfere.

20860. Have you an expectation that you will be able to make this an efficient model school, acceptable to both religions?—I have, provided we could get it connected with the Board. If we do not, I have very great doubt we should succeed—at least at present. What we may do hereafter is another thing.

20861. Mr. Stobbs.—At present one of the conditions for the master is, that he must be a member of the Established Church?—That is a condition imposed by the Chapter.

20862. Mr. Stobbs.—Will that condition apply to all the teachers of the school as well as to the head master?—No; at present we are only going to appoint one master, but besides the advantage of giving confidence to the people, by having it connected with the Board, we would get the material advantage of increase of salary for the master, books, and apparatus. I urged upon the Chapter, "If you are obliged to commit the man you may as well have the benefit of it." They said they would not force the children to read the Scriptures.

20863. The Chairman.—What school fees do you propose charging?—We have not arranged that yet. My idea is to charge for the classical class £4 a year; at the same time we have the power to reduce any one we please to be instructed without charge as, according to the foundation, the children of the poor are to be taught gratuitously.

20864. What would the ordinary school fees be for the primary part of education?—I think it would be gratuitous, because I do not think we could charge the poor people of Elphin anything. In our present National school the normal charge is a penny a week.

20865. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you propose to charge for the higher branches?—We propose to charge where parents are able to pay; but there are so many poor people in Elphin that I think very few of them can be called upon to pay.

20866. Mr. Stobbs.—Is the school to be worked under the coexistence clause?—The Chapter consists that there shall be a coexistence clause at the last Chapter to propose a resolution to the effect, that no person shall be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction without the consent of the parents, and to post a copy of the resolution in the school.

20867. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do the rules of the Court of Chancery set out under that point?—No; the Court of Chancery gives the option of putting it under the National Board, and taking it from the National Board if we please. The following is the rule of the Court on the subject:—

"That it shall be lawful for the Governor, if they think it expedient, from time to time, to place the school so established in connection with the National Board of Education in Ireland as a non-sectarian school, so as to obtain thereby the benefits of inspection and assistance in books from said Board, and for that purpose to make any changes in the rules and regulations hereby made which shall be requisite; and it shall also be lawful for the Governor, if he thinks it so to do, from time to time to remove said school from connection with the said Board."

20868. The Chairman.—Will you put in a copy of those rules?—I will. I now hand in a copy.\*

20869. If you merely charge a penny a week in this school, what will become of the existing school?—It will be absorbed. When we supply education to all the inhabitants of the town, and give it to the poor gratuitously, there is no medium.

\* Copy of the rules as amended in by the witness will be found in the Appendix No. XIV.

20870. Mr. Sullivan.—Would you be prepared to adopt the existing rule of the Board—to put out the children from religious instruction?—I answer, I consider we are committed to that without joining the Board.

20871. Of actually putting them out?—Of letting them out without putting them out.

20872. By the present rule of the Board no child is to be allowed to remain during religious instruction of a different religion without the express sanction of the parent?—There is not the slightest danger of any practical difficulty—the parents will take care to prevent their children attending during the hours of religious instruction. I am not very prone to look out for theoretical difficulties.

20873. That is the existing rule. Would that be a bar to your joining the Board?—Not a bit, because I know it would make no practical difficulty. A Commissioner asked me a question about the assistant masters, and I think it right to mention that I have always made it a rule, while I had a Protestant master, to have a Roman Catholic assistant, the vast majority of the children being Roman Catholic. Though I was never called upon to do so, yet I thought it was a kind of voluntary concession I ought to have made, and I did so.

20874. Mr. Gibson.—Do you think there ought to be any increase in the salaries of the teachers, in order to raise their efficiency and to benefit the schools?—I think that from the way in which these people are paid with whom the teachers are, in general, connected, that the latter are not badly paid, so far as regards the State, but their salaries ought to be augmented by local contributions, and, at the same time, I think it would be very desirable to further raise their salaries in the way of reward, when they deserve it.

20875. You are aware that a good service salary has been allowed to teachers after a certain number of years?—I am aware of that, but I don't know the particulars of it.

20876. What is your opinion about an arrangement by which a teacher should have a residence attached to his school and a small garden?—I think it would be very desirable.

20877. You spoke of a system under the Poor Law Boards, in which a committee would visit the schools at different times?—Yes.

20878. Would you propose to substitute that inspection for the inspection by the Board?—No, nor would I take the schools from under the Board. I should not interfere with the Board, but I would make them, at the same time, report for the information of the Poor Law Board. I should not interfere with the government or management of the school.

20879. You think this Committee would discharge the office of an ordinary patron?—Something of that kind. The great object is to create an interest amongst the laity in the education of the people.

20880. Do you think it likely that plan of yours would work, considering the composition of the Poor Law Boards?—I do. I think in every board you would get a sufficient number of intelligent men who would take an interest in that after a while. A Board of Guardians is a very large body. They are the ratepayers of the country and the magistrates. I think you would have a great deal of ability available in that way, and it is a kind of occupation, I think, that when they would get accustomed to it they would take an interest in, especially when it became their duty to report every year upon the state of education in the district.

20881. Have you ever considered the question of having paid chaplains in connexion with the model schools of the Board?—I have not.

20882. Would you object to the principle that there should be a chaplain of each denomination paid for superintending the religious teaching of the teachers and pupils?—I don't think there is any necessity for it. I think the clergyman of each denomination in each parish will think it his duty to look after the children.

20883. You are aware that the late Archbishop Whately actually paid from his own private resources a

chaplain to attend in the model schools in Millborough-street for the teachers and pupils of his Church there?—Yes; probably a large place like Dublin might be differently circumstanced, but I think generally in the country it would be unnecessary. There is no objection to it except the expense. In my reference I made to the Inspectors, I did not intend anything derogating to them. I think they are most respectable, conventional men.

20884. You said it was their duty to find fault?—Yes, but I would wrong myself if I said a word to their disadvantage. They have a very high standard, and one that is to some extent not attainable.

20885. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In referring to the parties to make a choice of the school committee, should you limit that to the Guardians themselves?—I would. I would leave it to the whole body of Guardians, they would generally select the right men—the most intelligent men.

20886. Should you restrict the parties to be members of the committee to the members of the Boards of Guardians?—I think so; for this reason—they are the representatives of the ratepayers. Suppose you impose a rate of two pence in the pound on the country, that would probably bring in something over £100,000. It would be a very small rate upon each person, but it would be an immense service. I think there ought to be in every Poor Law union in Ireland a superior class school—a first-rate English school, with a classical class. The classics would be required but by a few. There is a certain class of men to whose use it would be very useful; for instance, a great number of farmers who send their sons to the medical profession—that is a very popular profession amongst farmers for their sons. I would give them some opportunity of learning classics in a school in every Poor Law union. Then there is another class to whom it would be very useful—respectable farmers who wish to have their sons Roman Catholic clergymen. I don't see why he should be deprived of the opportunity, especially if he assisted in paying for it. By the rate, you would, I have no doubt, immensely improve the education of the country. There is another thing I proposed some years ago, indeed to two or three Viceroys. Some of those situations now given to county teachers, if they were placed for competition within a certain area, and all within that area allowed to compete for them, such as situations in the Cisteria, which the farmers are very anxious to get for their sons, if such situations were set forward for competition it would do more to promote education than you can possibly conceive.

20887. Should you regard that as having a beneficial effect upon the country generally?—I do.

20888. And should you regard the rate as also acceptable to the people?—It is never pleasant to have anything to pay until you get accustomed to it, but when they get accustomed to it, and see the benefits of it coming to their own doors, they would not object to it.

20889. Do you think the burden would be considered a great one?—I think not. A short time ago I gave a lecture at Elphin, as to the means of promoting the prosperity of Ireland. I had an audience of about 300 people, of those there were about 180 Roman Catholics. They took the greatest possible interest in the lecture, and they asked me to publish it, which I did, and they read it with the greatest pleasure, and I have hardly met any man who does not take a deep interest in education, I mean as far as regards the education of his own children.

20890. State briefly what topics you took?—I commenced by noticing the many societies there were in Ireland for the promotion of its interest, and I alluded to the Agricultural and some other societies. I said to get a National association to promote the improvement of the country by education would be more beneficial to them than any of these. I pointed out the advantages of education in a general way, and referred to many persons known from the neighbourhood, who had raised their position in life by education.

20891. Was it in connexion with the National

Dec. 2, 1866.

The Very Rev. William Warburton, D.D.

Dec. 3, 1860

The Very  
Rev. William  
Warburton,  
D.D.

schools generally these parties were advanced to—it was in some instances. Then I took occasion to point out the injury Penitential was doing to the country, I also stated that there was a mine of wealth in Ireland which was hardly opened, and that was in the genius of the people. I pointed out the many persons who had been raised in their own neighbourhood by education. I endeavoured to combat the idea that was abroad, that educated persons from Ireland had not fared play in England. I went to the different professions, and I showed them that we were at the head of the army, the head of the law, the head of the colonies. They read the lecture with the greatest delight, and I never saw people so interested in anything. If any of the gentlemen of the Commission have any fancy for it, I will, when I return, send three copies of the lecture.

20892. Are you in favour of the system of National education as at present administered in all departmental—I could not be otherwise, because I never failed to find during twenty years, under most difficult circumstances. During that whole period people were telling me, "It's a failure; we cannot have mixed education." I always had mixed education wherever I was. During upwards of twenty or twenty-five years in which I have kept these schools, I never had a single instance of religious dissension in them.

20893. Were all your schools mixed?—Yes, in the only two places in which I established them. I was newly fifteen years in one. The only difficulty I had in the first instance was from my own people.

20894. What district was that?—Kilberry, near Arthy. At first my own Protestant parishioners, being set on by some people, were very much annoyed. Some of them came to me, and said, "Oh, sir, we hear the priest will come in, and do this, that, and the other thing." I said, "When he does, do you send your children out of the school."

20895. Did you find your own people labouring under great misapprehensions?—So much so that at first many of them took away their children. I took no notice of them. I said "I am very sorry that the children don't come, but that is your affair, not mine." Then they dropped back by degrees, and when they came back, I used to talk to the parents, and they were very much surprised to find some of the evil effects they were led to believe would follow. One poor woman—a good, worthy, strong Protestant woman—she sent her children to the school, and found they got on extremely well, and she said to me, "What is it the clergymen of the Established Church object to in these schools? I can see nothing wrong in them." I said, "You may be sure I would not establish them if I saw anything wrong in them." I never met anyone practically acquainted with them—any poor person—who found any fault with them.

20896. Yours is a non-sect school?—Yes.

20897. Did you impart religious instruction?—All ways to the children of my own flock. Not to any others.

20898. Then you have had considerable experience of imparting religious instruction in that way?—I have had the experience of between twenty and twenty-five years, and never found the slightest difficulty. More than that, I never saw people disposed to make difficulty when they see you go straightforward, and that you don't want to do anything beyond the rules and regulations. I think there is no difficulty in it.

20899. Is it your opinion that religious instruction, to be efficient, should be distinct from secular, and separate and given altogether apart from it?—I think so. All our literature is impregnated with religion, but there is no distinctive religion in it. It is impossible to take any of our modern school books—the books of the National Board—and not to find them impregnated with religion. They meet more or less improve the moral tone and feeling of the children who read them, though they are not called books for religious teaching.

20900. That is to say in your opinion the instruction in the National schools is literary and moral,

but that the religious instruction is separate and should be separate?—Yes, I think so.

20901. Mr. Stokes.—Do you not regard the success of the National school system as worked by you as attributable to the just regard you have always shown to the wishes and feelings of others as you acted?—I think so, because the people had confidence that I would not abuse any trust reposed in me. A great deal depends in these matters upon the personal feeling you have with the people about you. Little things very often happen that if a person were disposed to be easily put out, might annoy him, and he might show it. You must be very careful in general to take things good-humouredly and quietly. If any little unpleasant occurrence happens—not to make it worse by stirring it; let it pass by. I think a great deal of the difficulty of working these schools is from the sufficiency, if not the bad feeling, that arises between persons who would be interested in either supporting or opposing them.

20902. In forming your school committees in connection with Boards of Guardians, do you include or exclude clergymen of all denominations?—They would be necessarily excluded, because they are not guardians. I would not exclude anybody except those whom the law excludes. They are the body of guardians who represent the ratepayers, who pay the taxes, therefore I would confine the committee to them. I would admit on the committee any one who was a guardian, but not any other person whether he was desirable or not in the abstract.

20903. What would be the duties of the committee towards particular schools?—Merely to inspect and to suggest to the Board anything that affords inspection they thought fit—and then they would every year make their reports upon the education of the country generally. I think these reports would have a powerful effect upon the masters, and also they would be extremely useful in exciting an interest in the education of the country.

20904. Do you contemplate that the committee should manage the schools?—No, but I would give them permission to give rewards to masters if they thought they deserved them. I would not allow them to interfere with the management of the school, except by recommendations.

20905. How would you administer the rate?—The rate would be paid into a common fund, and then, every year paid to each master in the union.

20906. Do you think the committee should pay to the masters direct, and not through the hands of the managers?—Not the committee, but the Poor Law Union, by a general order, should pay the money to the masters. I think the masters and people should know it was the rate money they were getting. Then, the rest of the money would be paid by the National Board, under which the school would be administered.

20907. Would the Poor Law Committee take no part in the administration of the funds raised by the rate for the school?—Except paying them over to the masters. They would be paid by order of the Board of Guardians on the report of the committee. Though they would have no power of interference with the school, yet their observations would, no doubt, have great weight with the institution in public.

20908. Would the rate go to relieve the Consolidated Fund of part of the grant now made for elementary education, or would the rate be in addition to it?—In addition. My object would be besides improving the present schools, to establish in every union this superior class of schools, so that the advantages of competition and emulation would be open to the whole country.

20909. In making additions to the income of schools from funds raised by a rate, would it be desirable that the increase of the income of the master should bear some proportion to the work done?—That it would have a bad effect. In cases where the people would not give sufficient attendance you could not expect so favorable results in such cases, but you might superadd to make use a scale of remuneration in reference to results.

Dec. 3, 1878.  
The Very  
Rev. William  
Warburton,  
&c.

It would not do to starve out the master because he happened to be in a poor district. I would rather help poor districts, but when you had done that you might, as a stimulus to the master, give him a payment for results.

20910 Have you ever in your schools employed female teachers?—I had a female school as well as a male school for all the time till about a year ago. There is a convent school lately built in the town of Elphin. Until that I had a female school. Wherever there is a convent built it absorbs the schools in the whole neighbourhood—not only the schools of Protestant, but of Roman Catholic patrons.

20911 Have you had mixed schools—for boys and girls?—No, always separate schools.

20912 Do you not think in these places in course of time, it will happen that the schools will have to be taught by females?—I don't think the population is low enough for that yet. I can easily conceive a case in which it would be necessary. I think it would be always better to have the schools separate.

20913 Mr. O'Shea—I thought in your examination in chief you contemplated introducing this rate only in aid of poor schools?—No, I would have it over the country, to the same extent as the poor law unions.

20914 The Chairman—How long has the convent school you speak of been in operation?—A best a year.

20915 Have you any knowledge of the quality of the education given in it?—It is very new at present. Some of the parents tell me they are very sorry the other schools are done up. The convent schools are only commencing. It is not fair to judge at present. Generally speaking, convent schools are very efficient. I do not speak from my own knowledge, but from report.

20916 What is the number of children attending this convent school?—A very large number.

20917 More than 100?—More; I think between 100 and 200. That is very large, unless there is good teaching power. In seasons of time they will very probably require teachers, and have good schools.

20918 Are children admitted into the school?—Oh, yes, and into the convent. There is a daughter of a friend of mine in it, and I have gone in myself to visit her.

20919 Mr. Stoker—Is it a National school?—It is, I believe. I rather think it is connected with the Board. The Commissioners of National Education are always very considerate in these matters. As soon as my school was closed they sent me the statement which was made to them that the school was closed, and to ask me was it the case, and if I had any objection to a grant. I think this was the convent school. I replied it was true my school was shut up, and that I never had any objection to education being given; on the contrary, I thought it was very desirable it should be given.

20920 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Is it your opinion, in connexion with large schools, whether convent or other, to make them efficient there should be a considerable number of rooms, and that they should be well supplied with teachers?—I think so. If you have not a sufficient supply of teachers the teaching will be deficient.

20921 So far, practically, separate schools?—Yes. If you have large bodies of children unless you divide them you will not carry on education efficiently. I don't speak from experience.

20922 Are they drafted from great distances?—I think not. All the schools within their reach have been absorbed.

20923 To what extent?—Probably not more than a couple of miles. But I cannot speak with any certainty. That is my opinion.

20924 Mr. Deane—Is your school a vested or a non-vested school?—A non-vested.

20925 Is your teacher a member of the Established Church or a Roman Catholic?—Well, I got into great disgrace some time ago, when I was paraded by a good Protestant in the papers for my toleration; if you do anything of this kind here that is the way you are

punished for it. There is to be a school under Bishop Hodson's endowment, which we were to have established this time twelve months. I think, it was about the August before I had to part with my master; I could not, as I thought, for three months appoint a Protestant master to take charge of it, and I had my choice of getting it in charge of the Roman Catholic master or breaking it up. As I am a practical man I thought it was better to leave it in charge of the Roman Catholic master under the Board than to break it up. And amongst other high crimes and misdemeanours it was charged against me that I had a Roman Catholic teacher—that I "had carried conciliating policy so far as to appoint a Roman Catholic teacher," and that I had excluded the Scriptures from the schools. This was published in a Protestant journal in this town. The truth of the matter was simply this, we were last year to have appointed Bishop Hodson's schoolmaster, I think it was the August before my master left, we arranged to appoint the master last October twelvemonth. The chapter met, we had a long discussion about putting the school in connexion with the Board, I could have carried it then, but they asked for delay; I protested against delay. They said, "Oh, what can a few weeks' delay come?" We adjourned the chapter. When I wrote to the bishop to ask him to come he was ill; when he got well it was my turn to be ill, and I was extremely ill for five or six months, and very near not recovering. Afterwards I had to go abroad for my health which postponed our operations for a year, and all that time the master was a Roman Catholic, but up to that time I always had a Protestant teacher for the school.

20926 At the time the objection was raised against your school by, I think you said, Dr. Giblin, the Roman Catholic Bishop, was your school being taught by a Protestant?—It was. It was on that ground he said he objected. When I say that I must add that, as far as I heard, everything he did it was in a gentlemanlike proper way. I have no fault to find.

20927 But on a fact when the objection was raised against your school it was being taught by a Protestant?—It was; but my own opinion is, that if you give the people a good education, not interfering with their religion, and that they have confidence that you will not interfere with it, they won't be prevented by anybody from having their children educated, and that the only way they can be prevented is by establishing an efficient school for them on a different principle.

20928 As has been done by the establishment of the same school in Elphin, which closed the other?—Readily.

20929 Your school, being a non-vested school, have you given permission or refused permission for religious instruction being given in your school by Roman Catholic clergymen?—I have never been asked permission. The Roman Catholic clergy are in the habit of taking the children up at their own school for catechetical instruction, and they have never asked me to allow them to catechise in mine.

20930 Would you have any objection to giving that permission in case it were asked?—It is better for me not to say what I will do until the occasion arises.

20931 Is it the habit of Roman Catholic clergymen to give religious instruction in non-vested schools, the patrons of which are of the Established Church?—I don't think it is. The Roman Catholic clergymen have their own arrangements for the instruction of their children, and I don't think they want it.

20932 What amount of jurisdiction would you propose to give to Boards of Guardians under the scheme which you have shadowed forth?—I merely would look upon them as visitors and assistants in superintending the schools. Without having any power, they would exercise a great deal of influence no doubt upon the Board by their reports, if their reports were as judicious as I would expect them to be, but I would not give them any power in the schools till the system was established.

20933 Who, under such circumstances should be

Dec. 2, 1886.  
The Very  
Rev. William  
Wardlaw,  
a.s.

the patrons?—The Poor Law Board of Guardians would be the patrons.

20934 They would have the appointment of the teachers?—Well, I think myself they would have the appointment, but, of course, any masters that were in being when they commenced their operations, should not be displaced without a cause.

20935 Do you not contemplate the possibility of great practical difficulties arising out of religious antipathies?—I think not. I think where practical men are at together these antipathies give way very much.

20936 Have not complaints arisen in regard to the appointment of teachers in poor law union workhouses themselves from religious questions?—There have been divisions, but when the appointments were made I have not known, in my experience, any unpleasant results. The poor law education goes on very well about me.

20937 Has it not been the case in several parts of Ireland that Boards of Guardians, the majority of whom were not Roman Catholics, while the parsons were exclusively Roman Catholics, have insisted upon appointing non-Roman Catholic teachers to teach Roman Catholic children?—I am not aware of it, but it may have occurred. I know Protestant gentlemen who have appointed Roman Catholic teachers to schools because the children are Roman Catholic. I think myself that spirit would generally prevail. I think the great body of the people, and even the gentry, agree in that opinion. All that is wanted is security and protection for all parties that their religious principles should not be tampered with.

20938 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you heard of there being divisions, and dissensions, at Boards of Guardians, even where all the candidates were Roman Catholic teachers?—I believe there are always dissensions. There is nothing is looked to be got that there are not people with friends pushing them forward for it. There is ten times as much contention when the doctor comes forward. I have known Roman Catholics abuse their friends for supporting doctors. That kind of thing does not depend altogether upon religion. It is merely the competition for some of the good things of this life. I think a great deal more is made of these things than they deserve. I am sure the men who might contend very strenuously for their friends at an election would work very cordially together when the thing was decided.

20939 Mr. Stobbs.—Your school is, strictly speaking, a Protestant school, with a conscience clause?—On the contrary, it is more a Roman Catholic school, because eight-tenths of the children are Roman Catholics. The same rules are applicable to all. I have a Protestant master always the head—and always a Roman Catholic assistant master.

20940 In schools of that kind, having the whole management of the school, and the head teacher a Protestant, no difficulty could arise with regard to the National Board?—Except I have been often told I could not have that kind of school, that it was impossible. I never could discover the difficulty of it.

20941 Practically, what is the distinction between your school and any ordinary Protestant school into which a conscience clause would be introduced?—There is no practical difference, because that is the National system—a school with a conscience clause. The principle is very new by the name.

20942 Is it not the teaching staff rather than the children who are taught that determines whether a school should be a mixed school?—No, I think what is taught in a mixed system is that the pupils are mixed.

20943 You would call it a system mixed where all the teaching was Protestant if given to persons of a different religion?—When I talk of the mixed system I mean where Protestants and Roman Catholics are educated together. It is where children of different religions are mixed together.

20944 That is your idea. Would Roman Catholics be satisfied to have the whole teaching and appointment of teachers placed in the hands of persons of another religion?—I think so, where they had confidence

in the patrons. A man ought to be satisfied if he has what he wants, namely, education, without interfering with his religious views. It would satisfy me, and I think it ought to satisfy everybody. We cannot, of course, control the legislature, but I should say that, if I could, I would insist upon its giving a good education, that nobody could reasonably complain of, and unreasonable complaints I would not attend to.

20945 That is to say, provided you had the appointment of the teachers?—No, I would not put any condition of that kind. That would be according as it would happen.

20946 Would you be equally well satisfied if the patronage in all the schools was in the hands of the parish priest?—Of course I would rather have the management of my own school, but if the school was under the patronage of the parish priest, and I had no school of my own, and was sure my children would not be interfered with, I certainly would advise them to attend it. There is a case of that kind at present in my parish. There is a remote part of the parish where there is a policeman, he has one son. There are about 140 Roman Catholic children in the school, he sends the child every day to that school. I took very good care to look after that child, and to inquire whether he was interfered with or not. If he was I should certainly represent it to the Board, and the Board would visit the master with a very heavy penalty. That is the protection we have and ought to have.

20947 But on the whole, you would prefer having the management of the schools, and the patronage of it in your own hands?—I would certainly, but as a citizen I should not have a right to complain if I had not, and that my rights were respected.

20948 To refer to another point with regard to the Boards of Guardians, do you think the Roman Catholics of Ireland would be, or ought to be satisfied with having the whole power of appointment vested in an office Guardians, the great majority of whom would be of a different religion from their own?—Well, I would meet them on that. I would let the Committee be equally divided. I would do everything that would be perfectly fair. I say make the Committee half Roman Catholic and Protestant. I think you would on every Board had men who would act together, and greatly to the advantage of the public.

20949 There are parts of Ireland where there is not a single Roman Catholic on the Boards of Guardians?—Are there any such? In the North there may be. That would so far interfere with my principle that I could not carry it out. I would then accommodate myself to the circumstances, where I could not have Roman Catholic guardians on the committee I would appoint Roman Catholic rate-payers instead of guardians.

20950 Mr. Stobbs.—What objection do you see to giving the appointment of teachers to those who would manage the school from day to day?—I don't see any objection to it.

20951 With reference to mixed schools—take the case of a Church Education school attended by Roman Catholic children amongst others—would you call that a mixed school?—I have seen in the paper an assertion that the Church Education schools were mixed. When I talk of mixed schools it is not the teaching but the attendance I refer to.

20952 But do not the Church Education schools remain strictly denominational?—They do. I don't know as to the extent, but I confess I doubt very much the accuracy of the reports as regards the numbers attending them.

20953 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—As to denominations, is not that owing to restrictive rules, and to the fact of the society being a Church Education Society?—Certainly. I do not think they have the same mode in Church Education schools of checking the rolls as in National schools. In National schools the master may deceive you, but if he does he incurs great risk of being detected. For instance, a boy's name is put down in the



morning at eleven o'clock. If you visit the school and see the names down, and say where are the boys, I do not see them? That is a case of strong suspicion against the master of a National school. I do not think the Church Education schools have any safeguard of that kind. I met some years ago a clergyman—I may speak of him now, because he is beyond the reach of evil—he died. He told me he was appointed an Inspector for the Church Education schools in his district. He took the returns of the master, straggled his shoulders, and said "I did not see the pupils." He evidently from his manner did not believe the returns were correct. I think the National Board have taken the best possible means to see that human providence can go to prevent imposition of

that kind; and I believe if anybody in the place was to do it, even a person without connexion with the school, he could merely by constantly visiting the school prevent the possibility of deceit. Any man can walk into a National school no matter what his religion, and see if there is anything wrong. He can write down the number of pupils present on the day of his visit—that may be done every day in the year, and if it were done it would be impossible to have any deception.

20064. Is the system of inspection of the Church Education Society any check whatever upon the attendance?—Formerly it was not. Lately, I know nothing about it.

[Adjourned].

Dec 3, 1868

The Very Rev. William Warburton, D.D.

FIFTY-FOURTH DAY.—DUBLIN, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1868.

PRESBY:

The Right Hon. The Earl of Parnell, Chairman.

The Right Hon. Lord Clarendon.  
WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., M.C.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NATHAN STOKER, Esq.  
WILLIAM R. BULLIVANT, Esq., F.R.S.  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C. } Secretaries  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

RICHARD WILKINSON, Esq., sworn and examined.

Dec 3, 1868.

Richard Wilkinson, Esq.

20065. The Chairman.—Where do you reside?—In Londonderry, my lord.

20066. What is the office you hold under the Irish Society?—I am surveyor and architect to the Irish Society, and I am county surveyor of Londonderry. I also occasionally, in the absence of the general agent, act as coroner at present, act in his capacity.

20067. Have you anything to do either in the management of the estates or in the collection of the rents?—No, I have collected the rents on one occasion, in the absence, as I said before, of the general agent.

20068. What are the duties of your present office?—The Society seldom do anything of importance which involves any change, in conjunction with the general agent, in the buildings on their estates, without referring the matter to me. Their new schools are all designed by me and my partner.

20069. Are their schools under the Board of National Education?—Their schools are all under the Board of National Education with two exceptions.

20070. Where do the estates lie of which you are the surveyor?—Altogether in the county of Londonderry, and within three miles or thereabouts of the city of Londonderry and of the town of Coleraine.

20071. What is the average of the property?—I cannot answer, my lord. The average is not very large. There are some large. I cannot answer that precisely. Some thousands of acres, including the whole of the city of Londonderry, and the whole of the town of Coleraine, which, however, are let away almost altogether in chief rents.

20072. Are there any schools on the estate of a higher grade than the common National schools?—Two, my lord.

20073. What are they?—Coleraine Academical Institution, and what is called Foyle College at Londonderry.

20074. Are they wholly maintained by the Society?—No, my lord, neither.

20075. Do you know that the Society contributes to the maintenance of either?—Yes, my lord, I have a return here which shows it, giving to the school of Coleraine, I think, £200 a year. They gave the Coleraine school for a building fund £100 a year for five years, commencing in 1864. In 1860 they

decided upon giving an annual grant to this Coleraine Academical Institution, which was then a new one, and they subsequently agreed to give £100 additional, as well as I recollect. They give £200 a year altogether to the Coleraine Academical Institution.

20076. By whom was this Coleraine Academical Institution set on foot?—By local people; not by the Irish Society.

20077. Is it a place for giving lectures, or is it a middle school?—It is a place for a high-class classical education, as well as for a commercial education.

20078. Are you aware what number of pupils are in it?—The number of pupils is continually on the increase, my lord. I cannot answer you exactly, but I believe it is under 100.

20079. Do you consider the Institution to be in a flourishing condition?—Unquestionably. I speak from local report. The Society occasionally attend their examinations. I ought to have mentioned that in addition to these annual grants that they now pay, at the time of the erection of the buildings for the Coleraine Academical Institution, the Society subscribed liberally. The exact amount I do not remember. It occurred before my connexion with them.

20080. What are the purposes of the Foyle College?—It was originally a high-class classical school, recently a commercial department has been added. At one time, some thirty or forty years ago, it was one of the most successful in Ireland. A great many eminent men have been educated at it, among whom I may mention the two Lawrences, Sir John and Sir Henry, Sir Robert Montgomery, Bishop Jebb, and some others of almost equal fame.

20081. Was that set up by the Irish Society, or merely assisted?—No, my lord; it was not set up by the Irish Society. It appears from a Blue-book, published some years ago, that there is no record of the Irish Society having subscribed any sum, I think, whatever to the construction of the original building, but they subscribe up to the present time. They first endowed it, 1613, and now pay £350 a year for salaries of one principal and two assistant masters, also five exhibitions to Trinity College of £30 a year each, as well as the salaries of the teachers of the commercial school.

Dec. 1, 1872

Richard  
Williamson,  
etc.

20972. How many National schools are there on the estates of the Irish Society?—They subscribe to over 100 schools not on their estates or under their own control. There are two on the Coleraine portion of their estates, and two on the Londonderry portion, which are under their own control.

20973. Are they vested or non-vested schools?—Non-vested, so far as I understand.

20974. Were they built by the Society?—Yes; at the Coleraine school the number of pupils was increasing so much that they found it necessary to erect new buildings, which are not yet entirely completed.

20975. Are they in progress?—They are nearly completed, my lord; except levelling ground, and things of that sort, they are completed. They will cost when they are entirely finished, including extras, which always occur in every building, and fittings, perhaps an ornamental railing where there is now a wall, amounting about £5,000.

20976. How many children are they calculated to accommodate?—They will accommodate at least 500, but that depends on the scale allowed to each boy. At ten square feet for each pupil they will accommodate upwards of 500 pupils.

20977. On what principle did the Society go to selecting the schools to which, as you stated just now, they subscribed, not being on their own property?—That, my lord, is a good deal of it, involved in I might almost say antiquity. But these returns which I will hand in will give the date of the first occasion on which the grant was made to each National school. A number of these I believe were given as rewards for services to the Society in troublesome litigation they have had.

20978. Are many of these named subscriptions, dating from a remote period?—The first is Lough Foyle College or Londonderry Free Grammar School, 1613. I see also teachers cutting-out work for girls, Coleraine school, 1613.

20979. What sort of amounts are given to each separate school?—Five, ten, and fifteen pounds. About that. There are also Church parochial schools, which are about two English miles from Derry, £5 a year.

20980. Are they all situate within the county of Derry?—No, my lord; not all. There are some one or two out of it. There is Moville.

20981. Have the Society property in any other counties but Derry?—None, my lord.

20982. Who is the present head of the Irish Society?—Sir William Anderson Ross, lately Lord Mayor of London.

20983. Is he president for life?—Not nominally, my lord. All the officers, and he as the chief of them, are elected annually. Practically, we all hold office for life, or so, the inferior officers, during good behaviour. Each year we all get a circular announcing that we are again appointed to such an office.

20984. Sir, Stokes—How long have you held your present office?—I have held it more than seven years, and yet I am the oldest permanent officer that the Society has.

20985. Can you tell the object of the annual election to office?—It is part of their constitution that I could hardly go into. I presume it is intended to be in some sort a check upon the officers. It gives an opportunity, if I for instance am corrupt or anything, of raising the question upon that occasion without doing anything injurious.

20986. Is such election directed in the charter?—I cannot answer that. I presume so.

20987. What is the full name of the Irish Society?—It is a very long one—so long that I cannot really remember it. It is the Society of the New Plantation in Ulster in Ireland. It is a very long title. It is in Latin on their seal.

20988. Is it the society of the Governor and Assistants in London of the New Plantation in Ulster in Ireland?—That is it—Societas Colonizatorum, and so forth.

20989. Is not the Society in substance a Committee

of the Common Council of London?—I can hardly say that they are. There are twenty-six members of the court, of whom the governor and recorder are ex-officio members. Of the remaining twenty-four one-half goes out each year.

20990. How is the Irish Society elected?—Elected from the common council.

20991. Then no member of the Society except the governor remains in office longer than two years?—None, except the recorder.

20992. Is the Irish Society managed by a constantly changing body of London citizens?—It is, with the exception of the governor. Of course the governor himself has considerable influence over it from that very reason, that he knows more about it, necessarily, he and the officers, than the incoming members.

20993. Does the recorder take any part in the management of the Society?—I cannot answer, but he very rarely attends at their meetings in London; and I am perhaps giving a little out of my province in expressing any opinion whatsoever as to their management, I being, in point of fact, the most inferior of their officers except the auditor.

20994. What officers of the Society are there who, though elected from year to year, are practically permanent?—The governor, the solicitor, the secretary, the general agent, the surveyor.

20995. Where does the secretary reside?—London.

20996. Where does the agent live?—Government House, Londonderry. He is the local executive.

20997. And yourself?—And myself, when there is occasion for any information from me he asks me for advice.

20998. Who is in effect the manager of the Society—is it the secretary?—Oh, no, I should say the governor. The governor has more his own way than any person else. It would be wrong to call him the manager, because he is only one of whatever board of committee may be sitting; but I think I am not going too far in saying that he has more weight than any other individual member, from the permanence of his office.

20999. Does the property held by the Irish Society consist of the city of Londonderry, the town of Coleraine, 1,000 acres of land adjacent to Derry, 3,000 acres near Coleraine, fisheries in the Bann and Foyle, cloth, unweaved, &c.?—That is from the report of the old Education Commission, I presume. I do not think there is any other property, and their right to the cloth has been contested, but I believe that that litigation is now at an end.

21000. Is this property held under charter of James the First and Charles the Second?—It is.

21001. Is that portion of the London confiscated property which was considered to be indivisible at the time that the whole county of Derry was parcelled out among the twelve London companies which had contributed funds towards the new plantation?—I believe it was, but I am speaking without any personal knowledge. My knowledge on this subject is substantially gathered from that document you are reading from.

21002. Does it appear that the Irish Society or the Corporation of London ever made any payment to the Crown for that indivisible property which they hold?—I cannot tell.

21003. Does the Irish Society or the London Corporation claim any beneficial interest in the property?—No; not now.

21004. Are they not bare trustees for the purposes declared in the charter?—They are understood to be so. I believe that is substantially the case. But, if it be not so, any admission on my part, of course, would not bind them, because it is not a matter that comes within my personal cognizance. But I believe they admit themselves to be trustees.

21005. Did you ever look at the record of the suit between the Irish Society and the Skinners' Company, in 1836?—No, I have seen it, but I have never gone through it.

21006. Are you aware that the Lord Chancellor of

the day, the English Lord Chancellor, the late Lord Cottenham, in the year 1836, defined the trusts—I have no doubt that what you say is substantially correct, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

21007. Do you remember that the Lord Chancellor then stated, "These trusts are still continuing. They have still to provide for the Protestant religion, the Protestant establishment of that district, and with the establishment of religion in that district they have also to superintend and take care of that which is closely and intimately connected with religion, and is a part of it—the education of the inhabitants of the district?"—I have no personal knowledge of that document.

21008. Are you not aware that it has been held that the Irish Society is nothing more than a large charitable endowment for the North of Ireland?—I should not say, for the North of Ireland, I am not aware of any circumstances, to lead to that supposition.

21009. For a part of the North of Ireland?—I should say so—that part perhaps limited to their own estates.

21010. Was it not held that the trusts extended over the whole county of Derry?—Some people did maintain that; but the only evidence, that I am aware of, of an admission of that claim, is that there are a few schools not situate on their estates, but situate in the county of Derry, to which they do contribute. Whether that was in consequence of a desire of contributing the companies on whose estates they are I do not know, but I apprehend that the Society have never done any act to admit that their trusteeship extends beyond their own estates—at least I am aware of none.

21011. Of all the objects of the foundation is not the education of the district the one which seems most to bear the character of a continuing unfulfilled trust?—That would depend altogether on the nature of the charter. There are other things of nearly co-ordinate importance with education.

21012. The *Chairman*.—As what?—The improvement of the land and of the physical condition of their tenants, as well as their mental improvement.

21013. Mr. Stokes. —Do you remember the terms of the charter?—I do not.

21014. Are they not?—Whereas, the province of Ulster in our realm of Ireland for many years, now past, both grossly erred from the true religion of Christ and Divine grace, and hath abounded with superstition, inasmuch that for a long time it hath not only been harassed, torn, and wasted by private and domestic feuds, but also by foreign arms; we, deeply and heartily commiserating the wretched state of the said province, have entered it to be a work worthy of a Christian prince and of our royal functions to stir up and recall the same province from superstition, rebellion, calamity, and poverty, which heretofore have horribly ragged threats, to religious obedience, strength, and prosperity.\*

21015. Can you state what are the annual revenues of the Irish Society?—This account, published last year, which I put in, makes the total, £21,039 16s. 1d., for that year. That includes a total of £1,454 from the previous year.\*

21016. But, craving the balance?—There were some extraordinary sources of income for that year; for instance—one was, £3,900 for balance of the back-out of part of Lough Foyle dabs. That is not portion of their ordinary income. I should take their ordinary income to be something about £14,000, at present. It varies, though, considerably, according to the feelings of the labourers, which are not let for any extended term. The fisheries are now let at something about £1,100 a year more than they were lately.

21017. What are the expenses of management?—They are all detailed in this that I give you, they are very considerable.

21018. Do they come to about £3,000 a year?—Well, I will just give you some things taken from this

account. It is very satisfactorily and very fully set out here. There is—to the Corporation of Londonderry, £1,250. In aid of public improvements, building expenses, &c., in Londonderry, Coleraine, and Culmore Port, and lands, &c., £3,742; incidental expenses, as per general agents' accounts, £300; law expenses from the year 1861 to the present date, £1,361 1s. 4d. That is spread over a period of seven years, during which two very costly law-suits were going on; one, a law-suit about the abut, from which we have, as stated in a former part of the account, £3,900 recovered, and one about the fisheries of a part of the river Bann, which has now been settled.

21019. Did the Irish Society gain that suit?—They compromised it.

21020. Does not the grant to the corporation of Londonderry come out of the surplus—might it be considered not a necessary expense of the Society?—I take it that the Society are bound for all time to pay it, for I am not aware of anything to the contrary.

21021. Is not that grant made annually by the Irish Society?—It is voted annually.

21022. Have they not always refused to put it on any other footing?—I am not aware of that, but these are questions which the people in the London offices are more familiar with than we can be in Ireland; because it takes place at head-quarters, and we sometimes know only the results.

21023. How much of the expense and management is incurred in London?—Salary of clerk, £304; taxes, £462; law expenses—that of course, £1,360 in this account, with a fraction over.

21024. How much is distributed to the members of the Irish Society?—For their attendance, in this account, £631 4s. 3d., at forty meetings held during the year.

21025. Is it usual or lawful for trustees to take payment for the execution of a trust?—I cannot answer.

21026. Is any of the revenue of the Irish Society spent upon decencies?—No, at least I could not think it possible.

21027. Not within your memory?—Oh, it is not possible. I am quite sure it is not; nor would they do it. They are men of all shades of political opinion, some of them have strong conservative opinions, and some equally strong liberal opinions. We had last year an instance in Sir William Rose, who was formerly conservative member for Southampton, and Alderman Lamont, who was liberal member for London, until lately.

21028. Mr. Sullivan. —Did they not do so?—I cannot answer.

21029. Mr. Stokes. —Do you remember when Alderman Thompson died for Coleraine?—No.

21030. Were not £3,600 of the trust property of the Irish Society spent on that occasion on a contested election?—I know of nothing connected with political subjects, but I could not nor do I believe that the expenditure of one farthing of their income would either directly or indirectly be sanctioned for any such purpose now.

21031. Mr. Sullivan. —What do you say to this from the minutes of the Irish Society?—"20th of March, resolved, that a petition to Parliament against the return of Sir J. H. Poydars, should be presented." "25th of April, the Society recommended Alderman Copeland as a candidate for the representation of Coleraine, in consequence of which he requested the court to allow the Secretary to proceed to Coleraine to attend the election on his behalf." "11th May, the Society recommended Sir John Byng as a representative for the county of Londonderry."—What you?

21032. That is in the year 1851 when the present rules of the Society were made?—I have no knowledge of that. Be that as it may, I am perfectly certain that not one farthing of their money would be now, either directly or indirectly, expended for any political

Dec. 3, 1868.  
Richard  
Williamson,  
esq.

\* The Table handed in by the witness will be found at the end of this day's evidence, marked A.

Dec. 3, 1868.  
—  
Revised  
Witnesses  
(c)

purpose whatsoever. At the same time, I think it is right for me to mention that I understood that the nature of the inquiry that I was to give information or evidence about was to be with regard to their schools. This is going into matters that are really beyond my sphere of duty, and assumes the appearance of an inquiry into the original nature of the constitution of the Irish Society, and not as to the manner in which they discharge their trust with regard to their schools.

21033. Mr. Stokes.—Is an inquiry as to the application of the trust in it not necessary to ascertain how much the trust property is?—Yes, if the duties of the Commission extend so far, as to require us to whether it is trust property at all or not. I do not know what the duty of the Commission is, but I understood it was a Commission purely for eliciting information as regards the subject of primary education.

21034. After the expenses have been met, how is the surplus employed?—I do not know that there is a surplus. I think that they are in debt now.

21035. After the expenses of the Society have been discharged, what does the Society do with the surplus?—They expend it in all those schools that I have mentioned, and in assisting in the carrying out of various public works.

21036. Do they make grants to churches and chapels?—Not to Roman Catholic churches.

21037. Do they make grants to Presbyterian churches?—May.

21038. And to Protestant churches?—Rarely. They do not want to make. They have put an origin and fittings lately into an Episcopal plan of worship on their estate.

21039. Rev. Dr. Wolfe.—Can you state the amount given in aid to the Presbyterians?—I could make out an account for this one year; but they do not allocate any certain vote to such particular denomination. When a number of any Protestant denomination occurs before them with any project for improving their existing buildings, or erecting some schoolhouse, or other such buildings where their funds admit of it, they give money, according to no fixed proportion, but according to what they think the necessity of the case, and what they think deserves it most, whether it be Episcopal, or Methodist, or Presbyterian.

21040. Do they feel themselves bound to give a defalcation to any one person from year to year?—No.

21041. You say they do not give any to Roman Catholics?—I am not aware of their ever having done so.

21042. Is there any reason why?—I presume it must be from the terms of the Charter; but I must leave you to say that I threw myself upon your consideration as to how far, I being bound to answer all the questions you ask me, these refer to the constitution and the trusts of the Irish Society, or to the question of primary education.

21043. Mr. Stokes.—Is it your opinion that the Society considers itself prohibited by the terms of its Charter from making grants towards Roman Catholic churches or schools?—I cannot say that, not having read the Charter, but if I may state an impression, I would state that that is my impression.

21044. Now, the list of primary schools, which you have undertaken to put in, show the amount of grant to each, and the locality and description of each school?—It does, for instance, it gives the name of the National school, and it gives the amount, and the date of the original grant.

21045. How many grants do you say were made in 1868?—From £1 to £5. I did not say any so low as £1. I think £4 is the smallest. There are three grants, I perceive, here of £3, and one of £2 10s., to a school, to which they also give every year a subscription of £7 10s., and one is for a male teacher, and the other is for cutting out work for girls to sew. But £5 is the lowest grant usually.

21046. Who settles the amount of the grant?—The original grant is the one always referred to here as, for instance, "1841"—Female day school,

410." I have never known them to alter the original grant.

21047. Do you say that the grant does not vary, so that, although the wants of the place and the merit of the school may change from year to year, the grant to the National schools outside of their own estate does not vary?—No; that is, within my knowledge.

21048. If a school is struck off the list of the National schools, for inefficiency, does the Irish Society discontinue the grant?—I am not aware of any case in which a National school on their estate has been struck off for inefficiency.

21049. Are you not aware of such a case?—I am not.

21050. One of the Assistant Commissioners of the Endowed Schools' Commission reports, "I have found instances in which schools struck off the roll of the National Board, for the incompetency or misconduct of the teacher (and upon grounds which, on examination, I highly approved of), still continued as recipients of the grants of the Irish Society. In such cases the grants were not merely thrown away, but made productive of positive mischief, by enabling the teachers to hold out against the National Board, and by keeping possession of the school houses, to prevent the appointment of proper and efficient teachers. I beg to refer to my report on the schools at Ballymore, Molana, and Blenn's Mountain, in illustration of this statement."—Ballymore school is a very efficient one indeed. May I ask in the date of that?

21051. The 12th of December, 1866.—That is before my acquaintance with the Society's affairs. One of the first things I was directed by the Society to do on coming into office was to erect new schools at Ballymore, and there are now teachers in it. They have built a very commodious school, not a very handsome one, at an expense of £1,100 or £1,200. About the former school there was some difficulty that I never understood the nature of—about property. It was not the Society's school exclusively. About the nature of that I cannot inform you; the law agent may perhaps.

21052. But since a grant once made by the Society to a school is never varied from year to year, according to your statement, does it not follow that the merit, or worthlessness, cannot be taken into account?—It would be taken into account unprofessionally. When I said unprofessionally, I meant to imply that it was not a common case. In one year a grant of £7 10s. was increased to £10. But I have no doubt whatsoever that if there was any case of inefficiency made known to the Society they would discontinue the grant to that school.

21053. Does the Irish Society or any of its officers inspect the schools which it aids?—Rarely. I have here a list of statistics, a report which was made out by the Society's order in the year 1864, which gives the details of every school to which they made a grant. It gives the number of pupils and the nature of the management, for instance here:—National school, which is in Derry. It is under the National Board and receives £15 annually. There were present on that occasion sixty-four boys and fifty-five girls. And I am prepared to give you, as to each school here, more than a hundred details of that description.

21054. How are these details collected?—By sending round. Their general agent went round himself, or sent his confidential clerk, and collected them on a certain day. Each of them is on a different day. That which I read to you is on the 8th of November, 1863.

21055. Does the Society exercise any control or supervision over the school-houses, or the apparatus, or the teachers of schools, which it aids?—None, whatsoever, except its own school houses.

21056. Within what area do you say that the Society aids primary schools?—I think you said it was rather indefinite. No, I said they were scattered a good deal over the county of Derry, and two or three of them were in the county of Donegal.

21057. Are there none in Antrim?—I am not aware of any.

21058. Are the grants of the Society to primary schools all given to National schools, or are there any other classes of schools aided?—They give a grant to an *Evangelical* Smith school, if I do not mistake, in Derry. But there are more of them. There are a great many Presbyterian schools. I cannot tell whether they are under the National Board or not. I find "*Evangelical* Smith's Sunday-school, grant of £10." And there are others, I am sure—"Greenacres school, county Donegal."

21059. Are you prepared to state whether the grants are limited to Protestant schools?—I am not prepared to state that they are limited to Protestant schools, because the National schools are open to Roman Catholics; but there are no grants, so far as I am aware, to exclusively Catholic schools.

21060. Can you say what is the character of the religious instruction in the Coleraine school, which is under the Irish Society?—There is a difficulty about that. The Coleraine schools were entirely under the management of the Society until a few years ago, when they were put under the National Board. The Rev. Mr. O'Hara was very attentive to the management of the religious instruction of the pupils, but he is a man of very strong opinions against the National Board, and from the time that it was put under the Board he did not take an interest in it in the same way.

21061. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—To what church does he belong?—The Episcopalian. He is the Rector of Coleraine—the only living in the gift of the Society.

21062. Mr. Stokes.—How many teachers are employed in the Coleraine school?—I was here just down yesterday, but I know from recollection that there are six. There is an infant-school mistress, and I believe she has an assistant.

21063. Can you state their creeds?—No; I think they are all Presbyterians.

21064. How far would the following description, given by Mr. McGroarty, one of the Head Inspectors of the National Board, in 1855, still apply to that school?—"In the town of Coleraine there is on the part of the Established Church one of the largest scholastic institutions, perhaps, in the north of Ireland which is most richly endowed and supported by the Honorable the Irish Society in London, in which gratuitous education is given, and not only that, but a sum of £50 or £60 is distributed, annually, in the form of bursaries to the children, and that school is looked upon as almost entirely Protestant in its character, though some of the managing committee are members of the Roman Catholic Church, and some are Presbyterians. That circumstance will account to a great degree for the small number of children of the Established Church in attendance at the school referred to."—That description would generally, so far as my knowledge goes, apply still, except that I believe, without having any certain reasons to state it as a fact, that there is a larger number of Roman Catholics there now than that would seem to imply. The school has been considerably on the increase within my experience, and I attribute that mainly to the increased facilities for inspection given by putting it under the National Board. There was no person to look after it except the general agent of the Society when he came over, and, of course, his inspection must be very cursory, and not so efficient as that of a trained Inspector.

21065. It was represented to me last autumn in Coleraine, that whereas the former buildings of the Coleraine school were substantial and commodious, the Society was rebuilding them, at a cost of several thousand pounds, and this was regarded as a profligate waste of charitable funds: how far was such a statement correct?—I cannot agree to it; for they were continually crumbling, the teacher and the committee, of want of ventilation in the old school, and of want of appliances, and of want of classrooms, and besides, it was a dingy, filthy old building, and it had

been built for a great many years, and in the natural course of events its life was not very likely to be long.

21066. Is there any fixed sum which the Irish Society devotes to the promotion of secondary education?—That is, more advanced education?

21067. Yes?—No; they are at present in doubt, but have in contemplation a scheme for increasing their expenditure for it. They have given that sum that I mentioned to the Coleraine Assisted Institution, and the sum I have mentioned to the Londonderry Free School, or Foyle College, but for more than a year past there has been felt the want of a sound commercial education for the sons of the citizens of Londonderry and its neighborhood. Some of them applied to the head master of Foyle College for this, but he had neither the means nor the number of teachers necessary for carrying that out, to such an extent as the Society or the master would desire to see it done. The Society, therefore, entertained the project of establishing a purely commercial school. Shortly after they had considered it and were obtaining information about it, and were negotiating with the present head master for the purpose, a commercial school was established in the town independent of it; that was, I think, in February last. That was originally not denominational; one of the principal teachers was a Presbyterian, and the other was an Episcopalian, but the denominational element apparently entered into its management. Since then the Society have completed their arrangements for establishing a purely commercial school in connection with Foyle College, and under the head mastership of the classical teacher, who is one of the most efficient teachers in Ireland; he has proved himself to be so by his having largely increased the number in attendance at the school. It was thought, in consequence of the sort of antagonism that had been established, or that had involuntarily sprung up amongst the peoples' minds about it, without any direct hostility being extended, that the Foyle College commercial school would be a failure. The Society, however, removed the head master's residence from Foyle College, and converted a portion of his house into a commercial school and library, and that school was opened in August last, at the commencement of the present half year. I happened to be in it the other day and found the number of pupils to be then thirty-five, of whom some were Episcopalian, some Presbyterian, and a small number Roman Catholics; so the master, Mr. Robinson, tells me. The Society further had it in contemplation, or rather still have it under consideration, to make Foyle College altogether their own school, to undertake the maintenance of the buildings, and all the other duties connected with the ownership of the school, in the same way as they do now for the Coleraine primary school. That will involve a considerable expenditure, because it will be necessary to build a residence for the master some place in the vicinity of the school, and to make a considerable alteration in the buildings.

21068. Has there not been a question, as you say, whether two townlands held by the Irish Society should not of right belong to the Foyle College?—That question has been raised, with what propriety or otherwise, I am not prepared to say. It is a very knotty one, and, in point of fact, there is no certainty that it is the case; but it happens that the entire of the Society's estates lie either on the west side of the Foyle or on the east side of the Bann, with the exception of two townlands which are between these points, and some persons have started an idea, which may possibly be correct, that these two were intended for the endowment of the free school. So that as it may, however, in 1813 the society appear to have anticipated those grants that I have already mentioned.

21069. It is known, as a fact, that a certain number of acres were appropriated by James I. for a school in Londonderry, and that these acres are not now to be found?—Really that is a question I cannot answer, personally at all events, but it appears to me, if you will excuse me for saying so, it

Dec 3, 1885.

Richard Wilson, esq.

Dec. 2, 1886.

Richard  
Williams,  
esq.

must be, no doubt, in the Commission to inquire into it, but I am not the proper person to give the information.

21070 But you know you are here to represent Mr. Greene, who was nominated by the Society to give an information?—As to primary education, but not as to the original trusts of the Irish Society.

21071 Can you tell the amount of grant made by the Society towards the Magee Institute?—I can tell you what they originally contributed towards the erection of the building, and I can tell you from this return what they now give. I think it is £300 a year. In 1863 there is a grant of £250 for the salary of a professor of natural philosophy, &c.; and in the same year there is a further grant of £250 towards general expenses for five years.

21072 Can you say whether, originally, the Society offered twenty acres of land, and, when the land was declined, made a grant of £1,000 or more towards the erection of the Magee Institute?—That is a fact which does not come within my knowledge.

21073 What is the character of that institution?—It is managed altogether by Presbyterians, but it is not necessarily denominational. It is intended mainly for the education of ministers for the Presbyterian Church.

21074 Has any grant ever been made to any Roman Catholic school of secondary instruction?—There is none such, so far as I am aware, in the county of Londonderry.

21075 Did you ever happen to visit the Christian Brothers' schools in Derry?—No, I have seen them.

21076 Are you aware that these Brothers teach a very large number of boys in accommodations, some of which are poor, and the apparatus is scarcely six feet high, unsuitably close and quite unsuitable for educational purposes?—I am not aware of that. I am aware that there is, at least, one instance in which a little boy was unwilling to go to the Chapel school—I presume that is the Christian Brothers' school—and preferred to go to the Model school; but his parents and religious instructors would not permit him to go. The National model school is an institution of a most admirable nature.

21077 Are you aware that there are few, if any, Roman Catholics attending that institution?—I am not aware that there may not be many.

21078 Half a dozen perhaps?—I cannot answer that.

21079 Are you aware that that institution has been wholly condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities of the Roman Catholic Church?—Oh, that is a matter of notoriety. Perhaps I should not say "wholly condemned," but that Roman Catholics are forbidden to attend there; but I am not aware that the secular instruction given in those schools has ever been condemned, nor do I think it could be.

21080 But is not it practically the fact that Roman Catholics do not attend?—It is, that no considerable number of them attend. I am speaking of what I have as personal knowledge of—nothing but report.

21081 Is it not the fact that, according to the religious census of 1851, Roman Catholics form 58 per cent. of the whole inhabitants of Derry?—I presume it is; but that is a matter of documentary evidence which you have before you.

21082 Since the Irish Society holds very large funds in trust for the education of the inhabitants, as it you opinion that the educational wants of the largest and poorest portion of the inhabitants ought to be neglected by the Society?—I did not say, on any occasion, that the Society hold large funds in trust for education merely, that they hold funds in trust for the benefit of their estate is a fact; but, so far as I am aware, it is not specially for education.

21083 Are you prepared to controvert the decision of the Lord Chancellor, that the trust includes the education of the inhabitants?—Yes, it includes it, to the exclusion, I believe, of Roman Catholics, as you read.

21084 Do you know that the Commissioners of In-

quiry into the Corporation of London, in 1854, recommended that the Irish Society be dissolved, and its Charter repealed by Act of Parliament, and that its property be vested in a new set of trustees, whose number and character should be defined in the Act?—That is also a matter of history, of which I have no personal knowledge. But the report is extant, and can be referred to.

21085 Have you noticed that there was a concurrence of opinion among the witnesses from the North of Ireland who were examined before that Commission, to the effect that it would be very beneficial if the whole of the property of the Irish Society were sold, and the proceeds invested for the benefit of the trust?—That is also a matter of history, of which I have no special knowledge. That took place before my acquaintance with the affairs of the Society; but I am quite certain, at least so far as my impression goes, that no such recommendation would now be unanimously concurred in.

21086 And did not the majority of the Endowed Schools (Ireland) Commission recommend in 1868, that "immediate steps should be taken in order that all the funds devoted to education under the Charter of the Irish Society should assume a definite form, and be placed under a system of official management"?—So far as my personal knowledge goes, I do not know; but that is also a matter of history; but, however, if there was any occasion for complaint against the Society on that score, as to supervision of schools, they attempted to remedy it by putting them under the Board of National Education.

21087 The Commission went on to recommend—  
"That the scattered funds of the Society should be secured for, and concentrated on, a limited number of efficient endowed schools on this foundation in the county of Derry." If the property of the Irish Society were sold, and the proceeds invested as recommended by the Commission at what amount would you estimate the income from the investment?—That is a question which I should require to see their books on; but it would be a very large sum indeed. All their properties are not of equal value. For instance, their interest in the land which is moderately let, and great part of which is held in perpetuity, would be worth quite a different number of years' purchase from that not let in perpetuity, and that let on lease would be worth more than that held in will, and a large portion of their income besides, upwards of £4,000 is derived from the fisheries, and that, of course, would be worth a comparatively small number of years' purchase.

21088 But on the whole, a very large sum would be realized?—A very large sum.

21089 Perhaps you would not be disposed to give an opinion as to how much of that fund should go to support primary education?—That is beyond my province.

21090 Would you recommend that the portion, whichever it might be, assigned to education should be administered by the National Board, or would you confine the application to schools within a particular district, and the administration to some local parties?—I would certainly confine the allocation of the money to the hands of the Irish Society, and to the tenants of the Irish Society, or those who from their vicinity to their schools might be able to derive advantage from them. I think that is part of their trust.

21091 Would you propose that the schools so specially aided should be maintainable to aid from the general fund, or would you give them a double grant?—Do you mean from any State educational fund?

21092 Yes?—If I am to state my private opinion, I should like that the Society should have the control of everything of that nature on their own estate, so that they might not on the one hand get credit for the good done by any public body that might have the school under their control, or on the other hand, that they might not fall under the censure that might attach to the acts of any such public body.

Dec. 5, 1888.

Richard  
Williamson,  
esq.

21093. Would you propose that such schools should get aid from the Irish Society trust, and from the National Board grant also?—That is the case at present. That is a matter of policy that the Society themselves and Parliament would have to decide, and not I.

21094. Does it not give a great advantage to the ordinary schools aided by the Irish Society over other schools?—So far as the procuring of inspection, it does, and so far as it is increasing the incomes of the masters and mistresses, it does. But inspection is the thing that we want.

21095. Have you any arrangements for inspection by any officer of the Society?—Mr. Greene goes occasionally through them, and satisfies himself that everything, so far as he sees, is going on properly; but he cannot be supposed to interest himself so much, at least if I were in his place I would not interest myself so much in the teaching power of the different teachers, male and female, as the Inspector whose business that is solely, and who is accustomed to that and nothing else.

21096. Do you think that there is no officer of the Society qualified to carry out technically an efficient inspection of the schools?—Of course either Mr. Greene, or perhaps I might take upon myself to say that I should be quite capable of doing it; but it is not the turn of one's mind to do it, but if either of us set about making up our minds to study it, we, of course, could do it, but it would be much more efficient and satisfactory to have it done by men whose sole business it is. The society might, I believe, have put the management under the supervision of the Church Education Society's Inspectors, or the Erasmus Smith's schools; but they thought it would be more Catholic to do as they have done. The Court intended at least to include in their scheme of education members of all religious denominations.

21097. Master Brooke.—Then do you contribute to no Church Education school?—The Pump-street school is, I think, a Church Education Society's school. It is under the management of the dean. Glendernot Church school?—I have no doubt that that is not a National school, from my knowledge of the opinions of the rector, and then there is the Erasmus Smith's, which I read. At all events their grants are not confined exclusively to schools under the National Board.

21098. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You say that a very large number of your schools are under the National Board of Education?—Well, a very large number of the schools that we subscribe to. What we consider our own schools are those upon our estate, which we ourselves take the management of.

21099. And they are not under the Board of Education?—They are, with the exception of the Coleman Academical Institution and Foyle College, which are secondary education schools.

21100. Have you yourself personally visited those schools?—Yes.

21101. All, or most of them?—All.

21102. Can you speak of them as to their general efficiency?—As to some of them I can.

21103. What is your opinion as to the character of the education imparted—the secular instruction?—I have a very high opinion of it indeed in most of these cases in which I know anything about it.

21104. Can you say from personal knowledge whether the schools are of a mixed character as to religious denomination?—They are. There is no reason why they should not be, but of course the majority, the vast majority, are Presbyterian and Episcopalian Protestants.

21105. And are there any Roman Catholic children attending those schools?—Some.

21106. What is the character of the local management—under whom are they placed usually?—Foyle College is under local management, at least there are trustees. The bishop, and dean, and chapter are trustees; but until lately they have exercised, so far as I know, no supervision over the management of

Foyle College except the appointment of a teacher when a vacancy occurred. Lately they have been exerting themselves more, the bishop especially, in endeavouring to induce the society to take up those schools themselves and put them under the control of a body consisting jointly of members of the Episcopalian clergy and of some public persons in Derry, irrespective of religion, of some ministers of the Presbyterian Church, and of some members of the Irish Society.

21107. In the question I have put to you I have in view specially the schools for primary education?—Foyle College has recently, as I have mentioned already, commenced to give a very good description of primary education. That commenced last August.

21108. In reference to the question with respect to the model school in Derry, can you say whether there are many Roman Catholic teachers in Derry Model School?—I cannot answer that, but I believe they are almost exclusively Roman Catholics.

21109. You have not visited it, I suppose?—I have on occasions of examinations and that sort of thing.

21110. Mr. Wilson.—I believe, however, the society are liberal towards the model school in Derry—they give a subscription. That should be certainly mentioned. I believe about £50 a year, for premiums?—Yes, in 1884 they agreed to give a grant of £50 a year to Derry Model School for prizes. Those are called "The Irish Society's prizes."

21111. The Irish Society has been extending its liberality more largely of late years, has it not, than it was formerly in the habit of doing?—I cannot say that, nor do I believe it.

21112. The demands of the place have risen upon them considerably?—So far as I know, they have far many years done what I always considered they were bound to do—spent all their income. But it is a fact that their income has increased and will continue to increase from the natural course of events, and of course they will have more money to give away.

21113. If they get more and spend more it may be assumed that they are more liberal?—Not that their intentions are more liberal, but that their means are larger.

21114. The society do not set upon any restrictive principle in the distribution of the grants?—No, except so far as that I am not aware of any money having been ordered for any purely Roman Catholic purpose. It may have been, but I am not aware of any instance of it since my appointment.

21115. Do they contribute generally to Sunday schools?—They contribute to a considerable number of Sunday schools, both Episcopalian and Presbyterian, and also Wesleyan schools. They contribute to Sunday schools of all Protestant denominations. They do not contribute to the Independents. They do not want anything from them, at least I do not remember that they do.

21116. Mr. Deane.—Can you inform the Commission of the proportion of Roman Catholics, members of the Established Church, Presbyterians, and others that form the tenantry of the society?—I could not. The greater portion—the larger amount of the population is in the two towns of Derry and Coleraine. The rest of it is all a rural population—pretty rural—and I should think that in the rural districts the population is mainly Protestant.

21117. The *Chapmans*—Established or Presbyterian?—Well, the Presbyterians are in the majority generally, and I presume that they are on our estates also.

21118. Mr. Deane.—Are schools that are exclusively Roman Catholic the only ones to which the society has not contributed?—There are some local donations—the Independents, for instance—I do not know whether they have ever asked for aid. But so far as my knowledge goes, during the time that I have been an officer of the society no Roman Catholic body has ever applied to them for any grant. My impression is that they would not take it.

21119. In those cases in which aid has been given

Dec. 5, 1885

Richard  
Williamson  
esq.

to the Church schools or Sunday schools, in what way is it given? Is it simply a sum of money handed over to the parties who manage those schools and which they are allowed to expend in education in whatever way they think best, in aid of what they may have already?—Yes, altogether.

21129 You exercise no control over them?—Not directly, save that we had this statistical return prepared some years ago to see how far those grants were well disposed of. But neither we nor any person for us visit those ordinary schools to which grants for primary education are given. That is intrusted altogether to the management of the National Board, and to the local patron or manager of the school.

21131 Has any stranger free grant of money on like terms been ever offered to the Roman Catholic body?—I do not believe that any offer has ever been made of any grant to a school belonging to any particular denomination. When any particular body, whether educational or otherwise, stand in need of a grant, when they think they have a claim on the society, they come and ask them. We have applications for grants from ten sides away, within my recollection, for schools, and I am quite certain that the society has never offered anything to any denomination whatsoever, but when it has been asked from them they have considered it, and if they thought it was a proper case for the expenditure of some of their trust-fund they would give it. I do not think that any Roman Catholic body has ever applied.

21132 Mr. Stokes.—But there is no rule which would prevent the Society from granting aid to a Roman Catholic body if applications were made?—There is no rule that I am aware of. There is nothing in the standing orders that I see that makes any such order as that. The only thing that would ever be considered would be, I presume, in reference to the charter to ascertain if it was right, and how far they were not bound by the charter; and I have no doubt that if they were not constrained they would subscribe to Roman Catholic schools.

21133 If a grant were asked for a Roman Catholic school, which is likely to be one of the finest buildings in Derry, do you consider the Society would entertain that application?—I am quite sure they would, unless they were restrained by the charter. I know they would not at present, because they are in debt, as I said already.

21134 Mr. Sullivan.—Are you aware whether any application has ever been made to the Irish Society either at Derry or Coleraine for aid for a school conducted by Catholic bodies?—I am aware of no such instance. I am always present with the Visitation when they come over each year—what they call the Visitation of the Society—that is, usually sixteen or eighteen of the Court of twenty-six usually come over, and I hear all the applications. As far as I ever heard, no application has ever been made from a Roman Catholic body.

21135 Has your attention been directed to the complaints in the Derry papers and some others, that the Irish Society never makes any grants of that kind, and of their illiberality in that respect?—I do not remember that I have ever seen any articles of that kind, but I have no doubt of it. It is sometimes the fashion of certain of the papers to abuse the Irish Society, because they want to get something out of it, and they do occasionally make complaints approaching to that.

21136 But does not the fact of such complaints having come within your knowledge show that it is because the people of the locality know that it would not be given that they do not ask it?—I do not know that is the case.

21137 Do you not think that, in a place like Coleraine, where the Roman Catholics are very poor, they would be likely to apply to the Irish Society for aid, if there was any chance of getting it?—I do not know that they would be likely to apply to the Irish Society for aid.

21138 Under any circumstances?—Under any circumstances.

21139 Why?—I think that the same course of reasoning that induces them not to accept grants from the National Board would operate in this case also. That is my own impression, but I have no justification for it.

21140 You know the town of Coleraine, I suppose? Quite well.

21141 How many Roman Catholic schools are connected with the National Board in the town?—I cannot tell that. I know nothing of any of the schools except the model school and our own.

21142 Are you aware how many persons of each denomination attend the public schools of Coleraine altogether?—I am not aware. We have 420 on the list for our own school. But those are numbers that are printed and published in the returns.

21143 But still it comes fairly within the kind of information that the Commissioners expect to get from the agent of the Irish Society?—If I had been aware that I should be asked statistics of the population I should have prepared myself.

21144 What proportion do you think the Roman Catholic children actually attending school in Coleraine bear to the others?—I think they are in the majority.

21145 In Coleraine?—I should think so.

21146 Are you aware how many National schools there are in Coleraine, in the town, attended solely by Roman Catholics?—I am not.

21147 Are you aware whether there are any other Catholic schools in the town of Coleraine, except those connected with the National Board?—I am not aware whether there are or not.

21148 Then why did you say that the very same causes which prevented them joining the National Board would prevent them taking aid from the Irish Society, if the fact is that all their schools in Coleraine are connected with the National Board?—I do not say that is the fact. You asked my opinion and I gave it.

21149 But, if you have no doubt that there are as many schools attended by Roman Catholics in the town but those connected with the National Board, does that affect your opinion on the subject?—I do not know that there are as many schools in the town of Coleraine but those connected with the National Board.

21150 But suppose you were told that that is the case, and that there were no schools in Coleraine attended by Roman Catholics, except those under the National Board, would that alter your opinion as to the causes why they have not applied to the Irish Society for aid?—It would, materially, so far as Coleraine is concerned, entirely alter it.

21151 The Chairman.—What made you think that there would be, on the part of the Roman Catholics, an indisposition to accept assistance from the National Board?—That is a thing that is a matter of notoriety more than anything else. It is a fact, I believe, that the Roman Catholic hierarchy prefer denominational education to mixed education, and that is my reason for saying it and my only one.

21152 Mr. Sullivan.—Are not all the present schools of the Roman Catholics in the north of Ireland, except some Christian Brothers' schools, under the National Board?—I am not aware of that. The reason I say so is that it is a matter of notoriety in Derry that it is not desired that the Catholics should attend the model school, which is unquestionably a most excellent one.

21153 But that does not affect the real point at issue, which is this, that all the schools attended by the Roman Catholics in the north of Ireland, except the few who attend the Church Education Society and the Christian Brothers, are connected with the National Board?—That is a matter of which the members of this Commission are infinitely better judges than myself. My opinion is not entitled to much weight or value on that point.

21154 But still I may put this question to you—is it not a matter of notoriety in the north of Ireland amongst all classes, that if they were to make that application they would be refused?—I think it is the



aggression that they would be refused. If so it is because they have an idea that the charter did not empower the society to make that grant. But I am very certain of this, that the society would make grants and large grants—at least I believe they would make large grants—if they had the power to do so, and if application was made to them.

21143. The Chairman.—Is it in the habit of the society to make grants towards the building or enlargement of Roman Catholic places of worship?—I have never known an instance of their having made a grant for a Roman Catholic place of worship.

21144. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you ever known an instance of their being asked to do so?—Never.

21145. Mr. Stokes.—Grants have been made to Presbyterian churches in Antrim?—Not in Antrim. None out of Londonderry. I am sure not indeed. There was one made to a meeting-house in Donegal, but it was on the verge of their estate, and it was a meeting-house that many of their tenants attended.

21146. I think you mentioned the Coleraine Model School?—I have not been much in it.

21147. Have you watched the working of that school at all?—Never at any time.

21148. Have you heard of any scandal in that school which caused, some time ago, the removal of a number of the teachers?—I have heard some such rumour vaguely.

21149. You expressed a great deal of surprise that Roman Catholics felt a disinclination to send their children to such a school—would the scandal, with which it appears you are more or less acquainted, lessen that surprise?—Do you speak now of the Coleraine school?

21150. The Coleraine school?—I did not talk about Roman Catholics not attending the Coleraine Model School, I have no knowledge of that; it is of the Londonderry school I spoke.

21151. Did you not understand that the Londonderry school and the Coleraine school were condemned by the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church?—I understand that model schools generally have been condemned by them.

21152. Mr. Sullivan.—How far do the operations of the Irish Society extend?—Almost exclusively to the county of Londonderry.

21153. Are they not bound by their charter to maintain schools in all the places where the other companies have existed?—No, some of the other companies made an attempt to establish that principle; but whether it is a fact or not I cannot tell.

21154. Have they any in any of the other counties to which the estates extend?—We have no schools in Londonderry not on our own property; but the society contributes to some schools in Donegal.

21155. And any in Tyrone?—I think not. Greenacres—that is one in Donegal. Instahowen, Slievehead, and Morville, are also in Donegal. Carrigara, in Donegal, had a Sunday school. Tully, in Donegal. These are the only schools outside the county of Londonderry.

21156. Then when the estates were divided, and the other companies got estates in the different counties, did the original principle of the charter fall into abeyance altogether?—They did not; the London companies did not get estates in any other county except Londonderry.

21157. Only in Derry?—Only in Derry.

21158. Then on whom has the liability fallen to maintain the schools in other counties?—I cannot tell, but, so far as regards schools for secondary education,

there are royal schools in most of the other counties, so of course you all are aware. There is Dungannon Royal School, Portora Royal School, at Enniskillen, the royal school at Creen, the royal school at Armagh, the royal school at Rathfriland.

21159. But I suppose you are aware that there is no money whatsoever coming out of those estates to any royal school in the county of Londonderry?—There is no royal school, properly so called, in the county of Londonderry.

21160. The county of Londonderry is the county, of all others, where the greatest amount of education took place, and where there is the least amount given for education?—I do not say so; I say that the amount subscribed by the Irish Society for education, primary and secondary, in the county of Londonderry, is largely in excess of that granted for any other county.

21161. Do you know what the actual income of the royal school of Dungannon is?—I know something about the rent of the lands; I also know something about the income of the teachers. I presume you mean the amount expended?

21162. Expended?—The amount expended by the Irish Society for educational purposes is largely in excess of what was expended for Dungannon Royal School some years ago, when I knew much of it.

21163. What was the actual return by the Endowed Commission?—Will you allow me to supplement my answer by saying that from this return it appears that for the year 1867 the amount expended in Londonderry, and some schools throughout the county, was £1,800 12s. 6d. for educational purposes, and in the Coleraine division of the county £497 10s., making altogether £2,297 0s. 6d. I should think that our society gives at least double what is given by the other body. We pay £3,500 a year besides on large outlay on buildings.

21164. Mr. Stokes.—Did I understand you to say that the Irish Society made no grant towards the building of a Presbyterian meeting-house in the county of Antrim?—I am not aware of any such instance.

21165. Will you allow me to read an answer given by Alderman Humphrey, who, I think, was Governor of the society?—"It has been alleged that you have given money out of the plantations which were originally instituted—for instance, in the county of Antrim. To what amount was that done? We may have done so now and then. A poor Presbyterian clergyman may have come to us, and applied for a donation for building or improving a chapel. We have taken that into consideration, and given donations for those purposes."—"There has been no such instance within my knowledge, so far as my seven years' connection with the society extends."

21166. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you regard that as a *bona fide* statement that such a grant was made for such a purpose in the county of Antrim?—No; the answer is loosely worded, but it certainly admits of any person drawing that inference from it.

21167. Mr. Stokes.—Would it, in your opinion, be a proper administration of the trust funds of the Irish Society that so long as there was a Presbyterian chapel in the county of Antrim, or any other county, by which the surplus funds of the society might be absorbed, so long the poor Roman Catholic children living on the estate of the society would have no claim for assistance towards their education?—Every claim of the charter did not preclude it, and I should for my own part most gladly see them contribute to every Roman Catholic charity as well as any Protestant one.

Dec. 3, 1868.  
Richard  
Williamson,  
sq.

The Very Rev. LAURENCE CAMERON TOOLE sworn and examined.

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Cameron Toole

21170. The Chairman.—Will you state the Roman Catholic diocese to which you belong, the chapter of which you are the Canon, and the situation of any parochial charge you may have?—I am connected with the diocese of Salford, comprising the hundreds of Salford and Blackburn, the cathedral and chapter of

St. John's, in Salford, and the church to which I am attached as clergyman is St. Wilfred's, Hulme, Manchester.

21171. What are the Roman Catholic schools under the Committee of the Privy Council with which you are personally connected?—Those known by the names

Dec. 5, 1865.

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Canon Doyle

of St. Wilfrid's and St. Alphonsus'—two sets of schools.

21172. Are you manager of them?—Yes.

21173. Do you correspond on behalf of the St. Wilfrid's school with the Committee of Council on Education?—I do.

21174. What number of children have you on the books of those schools?—About 900.

21175. What is the average attendance out of that number?—I can tell the average attendance for last year by referring to papers. The average attendance in St. Wilfrid's boys' school for the last year was 215; in the girls' school it was 140, and in the infant school 253; in the St. Alphonsus' school, the average attendance is about 260.

21176. Are these children exclusively of the poorest class of the population?—Exclusively so.

21177. Do any of them pay school fees?—They all pay school fees, or have them paid for them.

21178. What are the various amounts that are charged?—From one penny to fourpence.

21179. Is that according to the condition of their parents, or according to the subjects that are taught?—It is according to the condition of the parents; the subjects are the same through the whole school, according to the arrangement of the Committee of Council.

21180. Are those the poorest children who receive assistance in their payments, and do all the children pay in advance?—On Monday or Tuesday mornings they pay for the week.

21181. Then there are none admitted absolutely free?—I have, to pay for them sometimes myself, or to find the money for them, still we have to refuse nuns who say they cannot pay. There is another reason for refusing to admit them sometimes; it is that we find when they are paid for by others, they do not attend regularly, and become a nuisance in the schools.

21182. Are the teachers in those schools ordinary teachers, or are they connected with any monastic body?—The teachers in the boys' school are ordinary teachers, certificated under the Committee of Council, assisted by pupil teachers. The teachers in the girls' school and in the infant schools are ladies connected with a religious community.

21183. What is the name of that community?—The Institute of the Blessed Virgin. They came originally from this neighbourhood, Rathfriland.

21184. Are they an exclusively educational body?—They have been so from their foundation in the reign of James I.

21185. Are they a body that prevail much in England?—No. They have only two large houses in Manchester and York. The house in York is a very old one.

21186. Are there nuns teaching in Manchester English or Irish generally?—Some are English and some are Irish. The principal teachers in the poor schools are English. They also are certificated.

21187. Are your masters remunerated by fixed salaries, or do they get the whole or part of the children's pence?—They have a fixed salary.

21188. Have you practically found it desirable to make weekly charges from the poorest people?—It is the practice, as we are obliged to provide sufficient money to enable us to the grants from the Committee of Council.

21189. Do you find that having to make the payment in advance increases the value set by the children and parents on the education given in the schools?—It does, but in many instances it does not necessarily act to the exclusion of some children, but if we find that the children have really good parents, who would be inclined to keep them at school, we do our utmost to obtain the money for their education.

21190. We have been told by some witnesses before this Commission that in some parts of Ireland managers discourage teachers from receiving money payments from the children. Is that a policy which you are at all disposed to practice in Manchester?—No, by no means. If I had to devise a great National scheme for the education of the poor, I would make it entirely free; but in our present condition it is a policy we

could not follow, or else we should have to find the money ourselves. For the extreme poor I think it ought to be entirely free.

21191. In managing the affairs of the school, with whom do you correspond?—The Secretary of the Committee of Council.

21192. What are the relations of your school with the Catholic School Committee?—I have no relation or connexion with them whatever, except that on two occasions I obtained some grants from them for building. On one occasion I obtained £200 towards a building, and on another occasion £50, that is all the connexion I have had with them, except to contribute towards the committee.

21193. Does the committee exercise any authority or control over your schools?—None whatever.

21194. Have you any members of the Church of England or Protestants attending the schools?—There may be a few, but they are so few that we never notice them. There may be four, or five, or six. We formerly had a greater number, perhaps about three times that number, but there are now so many Church of England schools built around mine that the Protestant children go to their own schools. I think there are nine Protestant schools in my neighbourhood.

21195. Are any of those children the children of mixed marriages?—In places like Manchester a great number of the children are the children of mixed marriages.

21196. Are there any special reasons why those children come to your schools?—None, except that it is the will of the parents. The schools have a good reputation, and the parents send their children to them thinking them to be good schools.

21197. Do you find that the present regulations of the Committee of Council hinder you in religious teaching?—Not in the least. It is perfectly free.

21198. When the Government Inspectors examine the schools do they examine in anything but secular teaching?—Nothing else. There is no inquiry upon any other subject.

21199. Have you ever had any experience of any schools in which, from a considerable mixture of Protestants, the conscience clause was a substantial matter in the management of those schools?—I believe my present schools are capable of holding 1,100 children. They have always been professedly Catholic schools, and I have not known any instance where there were any considerable number of Protestant children in such a Catholic school. If there were such a state of things as this, that a small number of poorer Catholics were obliged to go to a Protestant school supported by the State, or a small number of Protestants obliged to go to a Catholic school supported by the State, then I should say that in both cases there ought to be an exemption for the minority who are thus compelled to go there, from what I would term direct religious teaching.

21200. Do many of the children of your congregation go to Protestant schools?—They do occasionally to schools round about us. Parents are very whimsical sometimes, and our population being principally the Irish poor, they are not in good circumstances, and we are obliged to keep the fees down as much as possible to meet their circumstances, then, when they get better off, they are so whimsical that they think that a higher priced school will produce a better article. However, after being away for six months or so they come back to us again. That is very common.

21201. Have any cases of disputes as to conversion and interference with religious belief arisen between you and the managers of the Protestant schools?—None.

21202. Have such questions arisen between you and the parents of those few Protestant children in the schools?—Never, because they send them by their own free act, and they can take them away by their own free act.

21203. Do you think the existing conscience clause in England interferes with the efficiency of the religious teaching in the schools?—No, because I think the conscience clause would be applicable principally in remote country places.

21204. Are there any periods of the day at which you make the Protestant children leave the school on account of distinctive religious instruction?—No. We make no difference, the act being voluntary on the part of the parents to send the children or not, and I consider it a great objection to introduce into a school, if we can avoid it, the knowledge of two different religions, or make exceptions in the school. With whatever few Protestants there may be we go on as usual, say the same prayers, and use the same hymns and catechism; they are not required to learn the catechism, but they hear the lessons. We take no particular notice if they don't know it.

21205. They are present, and hear whatever religious instruction goes on?—Yes, whatever goes on.

21206. And this with the knowledge of, and without any objection from, the parents?—So I presume.

21207. Has the religious instruction so commended, in any instance tended to change the belief afterwards of a child when he left the school?—I don't know that it has. I don't know of any instance.

21208. What is done with respect to those children of your congregation who attend the Protestant schools? Are they sent away at any hours for separate religious instruction?—No, I don't think they are. I never heard of it. The schools they generally send them to see, first, the New Jerusalem schools, and secondly, the Unitarian schools in Lower Mosley-street. That is a very large school kept by the Unitarians, in which there is no distinctive religious teaching, and I believe there is not any in the New Jerusalem schools. These are the two principal schools in which there are Catholic children. They may go to either for a motive for a few weeks, and then come back to us.

21209. Has it ever occurred, either to the Roman Catholic bishop or yourself, to forbid the children of your congregation going to particular schools on account of the amount of religious instruction given in the classes?—Yes, so long as we have good schools I should forbid them, if they listened to me, and re-associate with them. I think it my duty to watch over them and take care of them. I should forbid them to go to any Protestant school.

21210. I think you said a certain number did go to Protestant schools?—Well, it is in opposition to my will, and against my wish.

21211. How?—Have you reason to believe that there is a large number?—There is not a large number. It is something perhaps, like the number of Protestants that occasionally come to us. There may be three or four in a school, or perhaps a larger number in the Unitarian school.

21212. The Chairman.—You can understand they would prefer to come to your schools, but have some areas in which you or the bishop have felt it necessary to interpose in active opposition to Roman Catholic parents sending their children to Protestant schools?—We have had no active opposition except by words of recondemnation and counsel. One great ground of excuse that they have for sending their children to the schools I speak of is based on that which is such a prevalent idea here in Ireland, arising from the peculiar condition of the education of the poor—namely, if there is no religion taught in the school that was the ultimate good they had to expect. Having traced the history of opinion here, from the time when the schools in this country were called the Kildare-street schools, and met with such active opposition on the part of the Catholics, I find a general idea prevails, that as long as there were schools like the mixed or National system, in which there was no direct religious teaching, except under some peculiarly stringent rule, that was all the Catholics could hope or look for. Now, that idea pervades those from Ireland, who are in England, and it is one of the great evils we have to complain of, because it has led to a want of what I should call religious principle. It has depressed the minds of many of the people. I do not mean to say it has, in every instance, but it has demoralized them, but if his proposal, I should say, a great stimulus of immorality. Having first learned perforce to undervalue the rights

of conscience they find it advantageous in many instances to employ that undervaluing in life afterwards. There are many instances of that.

21213. You mean that they look merely to the goodness of the secular education given in the schools?—They have been led to look also to any interest—any temporal interest that will present itself to them. As to the goodness of the education, on schools are so good as those of our neighbours. My own has always been to have, and I think I have tolerably succeeded in having schools that stand as high as any in Manchester, as is shown by the reports of the Government. Still, if the parents can persuade themselves that there is no religion taught in another school not Catholic, they will often take the children away, and send them to that other school. I hold that religion taught in a school—taught to the poor in a school, is not merely taught by the direct instruction and words of the catechism, or by the explanations given of it by the clergyman, but, that the whole surroundings of the place constitute a part of it; just as in the case of a family, where the young receive instruction in respectability of character, and a sense of propriety, from the domestic arrangements, and from the life and conduct of parents, even more than from verbal counsels; so it must be in a school. The true religious teaching is in every action there, and at every moment it must pervade the atmosphere of the school.

21214. Had you anything to do with the discussion which took place between the Committee of Council and the Catholic School Committee, in arranging the terms upon which Roman Catholic schools should be submitted to Government inspection?—Nothing.

21215. Mr. Staker.—Did you take any part in the discussions on the bill proposed for Manchester and Salford some years ago?—Yes, I was examined before the Committee of the House of Commons, where the principal question was in regard to religion and education. It was a part of that scheme not only to require that if any of the religious denominations would open schools they should be such as to satisfy the conditions of the Committee of Council, but, that the local board, which it was proposed to establish in Manchester, might open schools on the simple condition that the Bible was read in them. I objected to that, for this reason, that it would give the local board an undue advantage for what, in want of a milder term, I would call proselytism; it would enable them, at a cheap rate, and without much expenditure of money, to go into the poorest neighbourhoods, which are composed of the poor Catholics from Ireland, and open schools there. We, the Catholics, on the other hand, could not open schools in such neighbourhoods unless we could provide an expensive, well fitted up and well-ventilated building, satisfying the conditions of the Council; though they might open a school in any workhouse-room on the condition of reading the Bible in it.

21216. Was that scheme promoted by Sir John Pakington, Sir J. K. Sturtessworth, and many other influential persons?—No; it was promoted by Canon Rickson, of Manchester Cathedral, but it was defeated.

21217. Do the Catholics of Manchester generally take the view that you have put before the Commissioners?—I believe so.

21218. How long have you been manager of primary schools in Manchester?—About twenty years, and about ten years in full connexion for all the departments of my schools, with the Committee of Council.

21219. Have you had experience of the management of schools under the Old Code, administered by the Committee of Council?—I came into connexion with the Committee, as I have stated, about ten years ago.

21220. Were your schools not connected before the introduction of the Revised Code?—Yes; the revised code is only about four or five years in operation.

21221. Under the Old Code did not the Privy Council grant salaries to masters directly, and to pupil teachers?—They paid for the pupil teachers, and supplemented the salaries of the masters. If I remember rightly, that was the rule.

21222. Did not the act which the master got under

Dec 8, 1869  
The Very  
Rev. Lawrence  
Cannon Toole.

Dec. 3, 1899

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Casson Toole.

the Old Code go directly to him from the Central office?—Yes, directly to him.

21223 Under the Revised Code how in the school aided?—First, by a payment for the average attendance, and secondly, upon the number of passes obtained, each child being required to pass in three points.

21224 Which of the two systems do you prefer?—I prefer the latter.

21225 Will you give your reasons for that preference?—Yes. In the first place, I see it complained by some that there is a falling off in the intelligence in the school. I do not believe that. I see a greater activity in the schools than before; because, a great deal of the examination, formerly, necessarily occurred in show and display, hence, those who were of a superior ability and sharpness of understanding were more prepared and qualified for the examination. The teacher himself, or herself, also performed the part of the examiner, in the presence of the Inspector. The child was familiar with the voice of the teacher, and with the manner of putting the questions. In the meantime, great numbers of slow and sluggish children that were a sort of drag upon the master, were left behind—not presented, and kept in the background, and the report depended on the general appearance of the school. Now, everything is reversed. There is not so much sought for. There are the three tests—reading, writing, and arithmetic, and each child passes through an examination. It is short, but effective, and gives greater satisfaction both to me, as manager, and to my teachers.

21226 Do you call the teachers who act under you find any difficulty in preparing the children for individual examination?—None whatever, because from the first day in the year to the last the object is, to have them prepared. Of course there may be a little more earnestness a week or two before the examination, but unless the work be carried out during the year they cannot be up to the mark at the end.

21227 Do you think the present system beneficial in the cases of backward children?—Most certainly, I will mention an instance in point. I know that formerly some boys in the school, even of those who were in ordinary attendance, were kept in the back ground; but now, although I find that last year the average attendance in the boy's school was 215, yet the number presented for examination was 219. We presented a larger number for examination than there was of average attendance. If a boy makes his attendance 200 times in the year, and has left the school, and obtained employment he is in some instances brought up for examination.

21228 Do you think that the Revised Code has had the effect of securing a more regular attendance?—I think it has. It must have done so, I think, although I could not speak to the matter positively. For this reason—that the master's or teacher's interest consists in having the children at the school; for if they do not attend regularly the teachers have their work to go over again, and that must tell on the result at the end of the year. The recommendations on the teacher's certificate depend on that.

21229 Financially, how do you find that the new system works for the school?—Quite as well, if not better than the former one, still though we get quite as much and as we did from the former system, I should like that it was extended, universally.

21230 Are you clearly of opinion that the system introduced by the Revised Code is an improvement on the old one?—I think it is. Indeed I am certain it is, short as the time is that the new system has been in existence.

21231 Do you speak with regard to the children and teachers, and the managers of schools?—I speak with regard to the children in the first place, then, as to the teachers, they are satisfied with it, and I do not know that they require anything more than to be satisfied. They know what they are doing, and what they have to do, and, truly, for myself—I have had the greatest satisfaction from the system.

21232 Do you attach it to Mr. Wilfrid's compass a

department for boys, one for girls, and one for infants?—Yes, the boy's school is sixty-four feet long by forty-five feet wide. The infant school is sixty-two feet long and thirty feet wide, and sixteen feet high. The girl's school which is over it is the same size, though being a half open roof it is twenty feet high, and is very well ventilated, and great as the number of children attending it are I see no objection to bringing so many children together. The rooms are well ventilated, and you never see the children asleep. They have good fresh air.

21233 What teaching staff do you employ in the boy's school?—A master, assistant master, both certificated, and two pupil teachers.

21234 Where did you procure your head master?—From this neighbourhood. When I wanted a master I applied to one of the Inspectors here, asking him if he could recommend me a good master. He told me of one, and on his recommendation I accepted him. The master came to me in October or November in 1898, stood examination for his certificate in the Christmas following—took his certificate under the Commission of Council, and has been with me since.

21235 Has he given you satisfaction?—Perfect satisfaction.

21236 From your observation of him and the information he has given you, have you formed any opinion of the National system as it exists in Ireland, compared with the system in operation in England?—From my own observation, and also from what I have heard from him, I must say that I not only prefer the system we have in England, but I do not like the system that is here. I must in the first place say he is not only a man of considerable ability, but of unusual respectability of character besides, and I am confident from many things I have heard from him, that I should not like to have some of the teachers who pass here in the training schools. What I deplore so much in that mixed or half-breed system—I will not say intelligent, but intelligent system—is that it has its effect, and must have its effect upon the master. One of their duties during the exercise of their profession must be to suppress and crush the profusion of religion which ought to be the great motive in a man's life, and to suggest it upon children, that it is a matter to be put on or put off, as occasion may require, instead of being one which should pervade every thought and every action.

21237 Was the assistant master brought up in your own school?—The assistant master began his education, I think, in our school, he became a pupil-teacher, served five years, and took a Queen's scholarship, went to the training college, and came back to me, and has been with me two years.

21238 Do you think the career of that young man is a good example of the usefulness of the system in England, embracing the training system?—I think it the most perfect evidence of it. He was the son of poor parents—a boy of considerable intelligence, and now a man of high respectability.

21239 Do all the pupil-teachers, employed in your school, live in your parish, or in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

21240 In Ireland you are aware that those who are called pupil-teachers are located in the model schools, and in England that system does not prevail?—No.

21241 You said, I think, that the average attendance of boys in our school was 215?—Yes. The number "present at all" in the school was 430, and the average attendance 215.

21242 How many did 100 percent for examination?—219.

21243 How every one of those boys so presented for examination made at least 200 attendance in the school?—Every one of them. I have the registers here to show it.

21244 Can you say how many of the boys passed in reading, writing, and arithmetic, respectively?—Yes. There were 219 presented for examination, and in the three classes there would be 657 points for passing, in those there were only five points failed.

In a special class of forty-nine, for grammar, there was one failure.

21245 Has the school been examined several times under the revised code?—Ever since the revised code was introduced, which, I think, was in 1863 or 1864.

21246 Has the school been examined by different inspectors?—By two.

21247 Have the results been pretty uniform?—The same in both cases. I think we got off a point or two better the last time.

21248 Is it one of the conditions of the revised code that every child presented for examination shall advance from class to class, or from standard to standard, as it is technically called, every year?—The same child cannot be presented in the same standard in two successive years. They must go on.

21249 Do you find any difficulty in producing that advance?—None whatever, because when they can pass satisfactorily in one standard, they are always ready for the next one.

21250 Have you brought with you, amongst other documents, a copy of any report on the schools which you could put in to show the exact particulars?—I have my portfolio here with the reports from the Secretary of the Committee of Council.

21251 Would you allow the Commissioners to look at them?—Yes, with pleasure. There are reports for each year, commencing with the year 1863, when we were first required to keep a portfolio.

21252 In speaking of the portfolio, is it a particular portfolio that must be kept in every school?—Yes, each school has its own portfolio.

21253 What is the use of the portfolio?—To keep the documents sent from the Committee of Council, the reports and the correspondence we may have with them, on any important points connected with the system.

21254 Is it required that all the official correspondence should be kept in the portfolio?—Yes, on all important points, I think.

21255 You said that the girls' school and infant school were taught by nuns?—Yes.

21256 Do they teach in any other school besides St. Wilfrid's?—No, those do not in any public school in Manchester, except St. Alphonsus'. In their convent they have boarding and day schools.

21257 What is the St. Alphonsus' school?—It is a school under the same management. It is about half a mile from St. Wilfrid's.

21258 Do the nuns teaching in the two schools live together?—Yes, they belong to the same community.

21259 Do you find it a convenience that they should do so?—Yes, a very great convenience.

21260 Would you think any rule objectionable that confined nuns of one community to teaching in one school?—I could see no advantage in that.

21261 Would it not be a hindrance to you in your work if they were not allowed to teach in more than one school?—Certainly, if I had half a dozen schools I should like to have the nuns in each, and I should consider it a great advantage, because as they have no individual interest in the matter, their living together, and being able to communicate freely with each other, would be for the public good.

21262 Are you aware that under the rules of the National Board, nuns belonging to a particular convent are not allowed to teach in more than one school?—No; I was not.

21263 Is it a rule that would concerned itself to your judgment?—No.

21264 Have the nuns who teach in your schools passed examination for certificates of merit?—Yes, all of them.

21265 Do you see any objection to that requirement of the Committee of Council?—It is painful to them when they are already professed nuns to have to come out and pass the examination. Ladies of respectability had to sacrifice a great deal of feeling in going to a distance to compete at a public examina-

tion, but we now have some who having served their pupil teachership, and taken their certificates at the close of their two years in the training college, embrace the religious life, and, of course, as all these examinations are over, they have nothing further to do than to show their certificates and receive upon them that commendation which is attendant on the examination.

21266 Do many of the convents in England find subjects qualified in the way you have described? I mean trained teachers?—Yes.

21267 Amongst those examined is there competition?—No; not strictly speaking, because the examination is all in writing.

21268 Looking at the matter from a State point of view, is it not the fact that when all persons fulfil the same conditions, the State is freed from inquiring whether any person is a brother or a nun?—I cannot see what reason the State should have to make the inquiry; so long as the persons fulfil the conditions of having competent knowledge, competent schools, and had received the State approbation of their qualifications. I cannot see what the State has to do in inquiring into private religious position.

21269 If, as in Ireland, nuns are not examined, and do not receive equal emoluments, does it not become necessary for the department of State to inquire as to their position in religion?—If the State does not give any emolument I do not see what title it has to inquire; but, if it does inquire, then to withhold emoluments from them would, I should say, be exceedingly unjust. If they produce a good result as a school, and instruct the children of the poor as efficiently as it is done by any others, I should hold it to be exceedingly unjust to deprive them of a fair remuneration for it on account of their religious character.

21270 Supposing the State should require persons to prove their qualifications generally as teachers by undergoing an examination, then would you say it was unjust to exclude from State aid any nuns who declined to undergo examination?—No, I should say the State ought to have a guarantee for the fitness of the persons whom they pay.

21271 Do you not regard the examination passed by nuns as one more sacrifice in the cause of charity made by ladies who devote their whole lives to good works?—I consider it so such.

21272 Can you tell what religious instruction is given in your school?—I have the time-tables for the three departments here; they will show.

21273 Will you put in these time-tables?—Yes (the time-tables were handed in).<sup>a</sup>

21274 At what hour is catechism?—At 9.40, religious instruction from twelve to halfpast twelve—that is in the nuns' school. One of the clergy—there are three with me—goes on Monday from three to four to give an explanation of the catechism.

21275 That explanation is given by you or one of your clergy?—Yes.

21276 Are you satisfied with the opportunities afforded to you as a priest for furnishing religious instruction to the children?—There is no hindrance whatever.

21277 Do you find the time given to religious instruction interferes with the progress in secular knowledge?—Not in the least. We satisfy all the conditions at the close of the year.

21278 What reading books do you use in your schools?—I have a set of them here (books produced).

21279 What books are they?—Brown's, of Portman-street, Portman-square, with the exception of the first one, an infant school primer, Crockett's and Berkeley's.

21280 How long have you used these books in your schools?—From the time of their being published. We used the predecessors of those books, the Catholic school series, from the time they were first published; formerly, on account of their great cheapness, we used the books of the Irish National Board.

Dec 2, 1898.

The Very Rev. Laurence Cleave Toole.

<sup>a</sup> The time-tables as handed in by the witness will be found at the end of this day's evidence, marked B.

Dec. 5, 1898

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Cassidy, Esq.

31281. Which set do you prefer?—This set, considerably; because, as I said before, the religious training of the children depends not merely on the few words of creed or doctrinal instruction that may be given now and again, but consists properly of the general outpouring of the school. We have in these books no pandering of religion, but at the same time they have a proper tone. There is nothing in them at variance with what we hold to be truth. One difficulty in the way of our procuring books is, and it is a peculiar difficulty in England at present, that much not formally opposed to us yet is indirectly opposed to us through the extent of the prejudice, want of Catholic knowledge, or peculiar ideas of those who compile school books. In fact, the books are made for Protestants as ours are made for Catholics.

31282. Do you highly value the freedom which you, as manager of the school, enjoy in the choice of the reading books?—Most highly. It is sometimes necessary to have a variety of books. If I had a book that is not inquisitorial, or that I do not consider inquisitorial, I do not care by whom it is published, we may adopt it and I take it. To give an instance, there is one of Nelson's school series; I use one of these in the *Sturdy school*. There are good lessons in it, there is nothing objectionable to Catholics in it. I use some of Longman's series. It is well to have a variety in the reading, that the children may not have the same forms of words committed to memory.

31283. Do you find the children acquire the art of reading quite as well by the use of the books you now employ, as they did when you used the Irish National school books?—Yes, these books are much better in composition.

31284. Can you say whether the Inspector finds positively any difficulty in examining schools in reading owing to the variety of the books which may be used in the different schools?—That I cannot speak about, for I only know of my own schools. The Inspector must know better, but I think from the form of the examinations he cannot find any difficulty. The Inspector has the book before him. He tells the child what page to read from, and the child does so in his presence.

31285. Have you brought with you the school registers kept in your school?—I have (register produced).

31286. These are the registers for a complete year?—Yes, and here is the admission-book. The examination schedules are in the end.

31287. Is there any form of registry which is of obligation in schools connected with the Privy Council?—None.

31288. As long as the schools register the facts required by the Privy Council may they keep what form of books they like?—As long as they register the matters required by the Privy Council we may keep what form of books we please.

31289. I think you said that to entitle a child to be presented for individual examination to the Inspector, the child must have made 200 attendances. What constitutes an attendance?—Half a day.

31290. What period makes up half a day?—Generally from nine to twelve, or from two to four or five, or to half-past four o'clock. Ours is from nine to half-past twelve, and then from about half-past one to about half-past four.

31291. In order that the child may get credit for an attendance, must it not be at least two hours under instruction?—The rolls must be called a certain time before closing of the school, and the children must be there at that time.

31292. Is not that time two hours?—I think it is, but I cannot speak about it exactly. That constitutes one of the first questions put by the Inspector going into the school.

31293. Is the attendance of children in your schools marked every day?—Yes.

31294. Is that a point to which the teacher pays very strict attention?—Yes.

31295. Does the teacher put a mark for the present

as well as for the absent?—I cannot say. I think he leaves a vacancy for one. One of the great points to secure the efficiency of a school when we are under the impression that we have a good teacher, is to leave him as free as possible with a responsibility to account at the close of the year.

31296. What is the number of your parishioners?—I should say about 10,000. We can approach it only by calculation.

31297. How many children do you calculate should be under instruction in your schools?—First, an examination of the statistics of the census I calculate that, in Lanesmore, the children between three and thirteen or three and the end of the twelfth year are one-fifth of the population. Therefore, I estimate the children in my parish at about 2,000. I have school accommodations for about 1,400 in all the schools.

31298. Is that accommodation completely filled?—No, the 2,000 includes persons of every class. There is a number sent to school at a distance. Numbers are half-timers employed in factories. Young females in domestic employment, and numbers of negligent parents whose children don't attend any school.

31299. Does the system of public aid, administered by the Privy Council, enable you to provide education for so many children of the labouring class as may reasonably be expected to go to school, or is there any part of your parish which, from poverty or the want of means on your part is necessarily neglected?—There is a part of the parish in which there is a considerable body of people, amongst whom it would be beneficial and desirable to have a school—if that school could be well supported. The parents are poor and headless—do not care to send their children to the present schools which are at a little distance. St. Alphonsus' school, of which I have spoken, is partly in that neighbourhood. It is only an infants' school, so does not go higher in instruction than the second standard. Still it does much good by training young children to a fondness for going to school before they are six or seven years of age. Hence, a higher school or department in the same neighbourhood would be desirable, if the aid given by the Privy Council would make it possible.

31300. Is it poverty of means which prevents you establishing it?—Yes.

31301. Though you regard the system of the Privy Council as efficient and good in the schools to which it has extended, would you say it does not reach the remainder—the lower class?—It most certainly does not reach it sufficiently, and hence we have what is called, in London and Liverpool, the Arab population. We have not so many of that class in Manchester. It is because there is no means of reaching that class, there is so great an Arab or vagrant population. In consequence of that a system was devised, known as the ragged school system, under which boys are taken in and supported who have been committed by magistrates. I think that is nothing more than an attempt to supply a defect by an evasion of the conditions of the Committee of Privy Council. I don't think that is beneficial except on a very limited scale, to individuals or to the community, because I can say the effect of it is to relieve some of the most careless parents of the town of the charge of their children and throwing the cost upon the public purse.

31302. Do you see your way to making any suggestion calculated to remedy that imperfection in the Privy Council system?—If the Privy Council would extend the means for providing schools in certain localities. In the neighbourhood I speak of it is impossible for me to build a school. I could not provide the means, yet it is very much wanted. If the Committee of Council would do that and supply salaries of teachers more generally, or admit teachers of a lower class or rank, who would not expect so great a salary as a certificated teacher does expect.

31303. Can you give any information about training schools for Catholic masters or mistresses in England?—are they separate or mixed in point of religion?

Separate; as exclusively Catholic for us, as exclusively Church of England for them, as exclusively Wesleyan, Methodist, and Independent, and so on, depending entirely upon the religious community to which they belong.

21304. Do the teachers trained in them, when they come out and teach schools, give satisfaction to the managers in point of character, attainments, and efficiency?—The only one I had from them was the assistant master I speak of, with whom I am heartily satisfied. I never heard of anyone who had a trained master from Hammerworth training school complain of him.

21305. Have you had teachers from the Liverpool training schools for mistresses?—Yes; those teachers at present in the girls' and infant school, are from the training school at Liverpool.

21306. Do they bear a high reputation?—Perfectly satisfactory. One of them, like the assistant master, served her apprenticeship with us.

21307. *Rev. Dr. Wilson.*—You have already said that fees are paid for children in attendance at your schools?—Yes.

21308. Should I understand you to say that if you had a choice in the case of the poor children, you should prefer to have no payment of fees?—Yes, I think that the system of National education intended for the great body of the laboring poor ought to be free, so as not in the first instance to have any impediments in the way of the parents sending their children to school, and in the second place, so to make distinctions that are very often painful.

21309. Do you not trace a connection between the irregularity of attendance to which you have referred, and the non-payment of fees in the schools?—Yes, I think that those who pay are the more punctual in attendance, because the parents are anxious to see their get an equivalent for their money, and hence I would associate with the scheme for the gratuitous education of the poor, compulsory attendance, making allowance for considerations as to health or family difficulties.

21310. And you expect that such a scheme would be easily carried out?—I don't see why it could not be carried out here as well as in other countries.

21311. Can you state what is the proportion between the payments received by you for your schools from the Committee of Council, and from your own school fees?—Well, it perhaps comes closely up towards one-third between what is paid and what we have made up, it is generally estimated that in a good paying school the fees are about one-third of the grant. I find, from the report of the deputation that visited upon the Duke of Buckingham, about last January, from the Social Science Congress, that they stated there were certain schools in which the school fees were only one-sixth, therefore, as these schools were in poor neighborhoods, they could not get sufficient money to be equal to that required by the Committee of Council for the grant. It would be too great a tax upon the charity of others, and there are not persons to pay it. That is one of the difficulties of our position. A school placed in that position with us has a certainty first of being poor, and therefore not capable of making its way, and secondly, of forfeiting what it would be entitled to for the work it had done from the Committee of Council, and thus make its poverty still greater.

21312. Then I understand the proportion of fees in your schools is smaller than throughout England generally?—Generally, it will be so in Catholic schools.

21313. In reference to your teachers, should I understand you to say he had learned to understand the rights of conscience?—No, I say the system must necessarily do that which sometimes leads men to suppress or keep under control their just convictions even in the proper walks of life, it must necessarily have that effect. I said my teacher was a man of high respectability of character, great firmness of mind, but these we could not expect in every man, and the

system under which a man is trained must necessarily have the effect upon him.

21314. Have not the persons belonging to your town, educated in National schools in Ireland, for the most part been educated in schools under Roman Catholic managers and Roman Catholic teachers?—I should suppose they have.

21315. I presume the religious instruction would be fairly attended to?—That is direct religious instruction, but I make great distinction between the direct religious instruction, and the indirect religious instruction. I think it is a great injury to the education of youth to make religion something like a travelling rag on a cold day, a thing to be put on for the occasion, and then to be laid aside as useless at other times.

21316. But under the management of Roman Catholic managers in Ireland in National schools not vested, may they not have religious instruction every day?—I suppose they may—with the school working here I am not acquainted. I can only speak from the inference I draw from the system, and what I know it must necessarily be.

21317. And in vested schools every day also given by the teacher?—I don't know what you mean by the word vested.

21318. Your teacher you say came from that neighborhood?—Yes.

21319. What place, may I ask?—I think Swords.

21320. Was he recommended to you by an Inspector of schools?—Yes.

21321. Which class?—Well, really I don't know.

21322. Under the Board?—Yes.

21323. An Inspector of the National Board of Education?—I asked some person if he could tell me the name of any respectable Inspector here upon whose judgment I could rely.

21324. Had he been a teacher in Ireland before going to Manchester?—Yes, I think he was at Swords.

21325. Do you know his classification?—No; but it was much higher than in England. If I remember rightly the Inspector told me he was preparing for the first-class examination.

21326. Was he a trained teacher?—He was.

21327. Do you consider that an advantage in his teaching?—Of course I consider a trained teacher an advantage as far as the school system goes. Trained skill in a profession must always be.

21328. Will you be so kind as just to describe a day's course of instruction in your own school in Manchester, briefly?—I hand you the two school timetables, which will tell you.

21329. Your schools are strictly denominational?—Strictly denominational.

21330. What is the character of the secular instruction?—Reading, writing, and arithmetic for the whole school, according to the standards as laid down by the Committee of Council, the table of which you have in their reports.

21331. Up to what age do children usually attend your school in the two departments?—They cannot stay after thirteen, because there is no room for them after thirteen.

21332. The girls?—The same. They more generally leave at about eleven years of age. The half-time factory work comes in about eleven, where the parents are very poor they generally go off to get to that work.

21333. The books you use, I presume, you regard as strictly denominational?—You may take the word denominational in two senses, that is as enforcing a doctrine, or as a book of religious dogma. You may take denominational in a wide sense as not containing anything adverse. For instance, the "Treatise on Natural History" might belong to any school, as far as I should hold it to be denominational; so far as suitable, the same in Roman, Jesuit, or historical, or indeed on anything.

21334. Should you say the ordinary reading books contained anything adverse to the known views of Protestants of different denominations?—Not directly.

De 2, 188.

The Very Rev. Lawrence Carter Toole.

Dec 2, 1866.

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
James Todd

or unduly adverse. We leave out of consideration Protestants and Presbyterians altogether. We look to our own affairs.

21335 Is this book (book three) adopted to the standard, a book in daily use in your schools?—Yes.  
21336 And read by all children, whether Protestants or Catholics?—Yes, if a Protestant sends his child to the school of course he takes own voluntary act.

21337 On page 28 I see an account given of the mass. Should you think that in accordance with Protestant views?—We don't take Protestants into consideration. In conducting the school we leave them to themselves to teach and to send their own. We read and teach our own.

21338 You regard this that I refer to in the Third Book as Catholic Doctrine?—If it is about the mass. Yes.

21339 Mr. Stokes—In fact you no more regard them in the school than you would regard them in church when preaching a sermon?—No more.

21340 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Then in your schools is there a blending of the religious instruction with the secular throughout?—If there be an opportunity, or a necessity arising from any slight lesson, or any other lesson in the course of the day, we are not silent upon it, but bring it in. In fact we illustrate it in any way we can by pointing out their duty to God, or pointing out truths of religion. For instance, when the clock strikes each child stands up, makes the sign of the cross, says a little prayer, or repeats a verse of a hymn.

21341 At all times of the day religious instruction may be conveyed in that way?—It is in the atmosphere—in the surroundings, of the place. There is nothing anti-Catholic in it, and therefore it is Catholic.

21342 He so kind as to state the relative proportions of the religious denominations of the people of Manchester?—The general population of Manchester and Salford I suppose now to be about half a million. Of these we can only estimate the Catholic population from the number of our baptisms. Now, when we come to consider the number of baptisms, in reckoning upon the mass we take, we have, in the first place, to make great allowances. The rate of births to population is shown by the census to be, in our neighbourhood, one in thirty. If we took one in thirty for the Catholic baptisms, it would give us a number far above anything we are certain we have. Hence, I hold, after consideration of the matter, that from one-tenth to twenty is quite sufficient to multiply by, and that would give us perhaps from 85,000 to 95,000 Catholics in Manchester.

21343 In coming to the average, have you calculated baptisms for twelve months?—Yes.

21344 What is your opinion as to the state of education in Manchester, speaking generally?—I think education in Manchester is very fair. Of course there is great room for improvement, but it is not at all behind other towns and places. The higher class education in Manchester generally stands very high.

21345 When I was in Manchester some short time ago I was informed, on what I presume to be high authority, that denominational education had left the rising generation in a very neglected condition in that entire district—should you concur in that opinion?—The opinions you would here there depend a good deal on the reliability upon the parties you get them from. There is a party there called the secular education party, who are the proprietors of a school in Jackson's-lane. That was a perfectly secular school. They maintain that all the blame was to be thrown upon religion; others, upon the other hand, maintain it is the religious element that has done so much good in Manchester. The Education Aid Society sent persons round, and they professed to report upon the great number of children that were left without education. The report attracted considerable attention, and the clergy of the Church of England undertook to investigate the truth of the report, but I never heard what was the issue of it. They took notice from my school.

I should think the number of those entirely neglected was over-estimated.

21346 My authority was a gentleman who has a high estimate of the value of religious education. His opinion was, that there were thousands of children of a school-going age being brought up in total ignorance in Manchester—so that your opinion?—No; I don't think you will find thousands of children in Manchester who had never been to school. It is the fault of their parents if they don't go to school. There is school accommodation for a considerably greater number of children than those who do attend.

21347 Mr. Sullivan—But, even if that were the case, would it be logical to attribute it to the fact that religion was taught in the schools?—Most illogical.

21348 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Can you state the number of Catholic schools in England?—I cannot.

21349 Or the average number of Catholic children in attendance at those schools?—I cannot.

21350 Mr. Vere Foster is regarded as somewhat of an authority in this country upon matters of education. Allow me to read for you his statement as regards the comparative popularity with Catholics of the English and Irish systems.—"The Catholic population of Ireland is four and a half millions, and the Catholic population of Great Britain is one million and a half. The average attendance of Catholic children in the National schools of Ireland is 257,000, and if the Government system in Great Britain were only equally popular with the Government system in Ireland we should expect to find one-third of that number of Catholics in attendance upon the schools there, which would be about 90,000. But what is it? It is only 45,000, so that the English system is not as popular with Roman Catholics as the National system is in Ireland. It neither permeates the country so well as the Irish system, nor is it so popular with the Catholics." May I ask you concur in the statement made by Mr. Vere Foster?—As to his figures, I cannot say anything about them, but as to his reasoning, I think it most fallacious. In the first place he leaves out of consideration the difference that there is between Ireland and England, and the difference between the condition of the Catholic population in Ireland and the Catholic population in England. First, the children up to thirteen years of age have no employment in Ireland. Therefore there is nothing to withdraw them from school. In the next place, the greater portion of the population of Ireland is agricultural, therefore there are not the attractions to withdraw the children from school. It is more easy for day-labour and schoolmasters to induce them to attend. But the Catholic population in England have a thousand employments open to them. For instance, one morning I walked into my own school, and I found fourteen or fifteen girls gone. "Where are they gone to?" To artificial flower-making." What school in Ireland would lose fourteen or fifteen girls of a morning by artificial flower-making? We have an attendance of only 215 out of a total on the roll of 450. Mr. Foster takes the difference between 215 and 450. That is in the boys' school, while in the girls' school I have 390 present during the year, and 140 in average attendance. There is another 200 there. In the infant school 550 on the roll during the year, with an average attendance of 385. There is a difference of 305. I have given you a difference of 700 between the number on the rolls and the real average attendance, upon which Mr. Foster bases his calculations. These children have not attended a sufficient number of times to qualify them to be entered into the average attendance, but that does not show they don't appreciate the school and system, and have not come within their range. Therefore I consider that gentleman's reasoning entirely fallacious, and that it is merely to make out a point.

21351 In your opinion has denominational education in England been a success or otherwise?—It has been a success most certainly. It is training up a better and more informed class of persons, and I could



only wish it were more widely extended for the purpose of doing a great deal of good.

21332. I presume you are aware it has been stated on good authority that there are some thousands of parsons into which England and Wales are divided, where it has not yet penetrated?—I am merely speaking in connection with the Catholics. The parishes to which you allude there will be those in which there are neither Catholic nor Dissenters in the remote parts of the country, where the only church in the place will be the Church of England, and perhaps the system may not have entered there in very poor parishes. In fact on looking over the reports of the Inspectors and other documents you will find there are complaints of that kind, and they complain that they cannot adopt the system on account of the great requirements of it to which I have alluded before.

21333. Now, you have observed, I think, that there has been considerable improvement since the introduction of the revised code in the departments of reading, writing, and arithmetic?—As far as my experience goes there has been.

21334. Have you noticed any serious drawbacks notwithstanding?—I don't know any drawback except that perhaps they may not know the north, south, east, and west of a map, or a little geography, which formerly were taught amongst the higher classes. They may know a little less of the analysis of sentences or parts of speech, but there is no other drawback that I know of.

21335. Is the system under the revised code calculated to awaken the intelligence and train the understanding of the children?—I think it is, and for this reason. In the first place you must consider what the poor are and the cause of their poverty. One great cause of poverty must necessarily be the lower degree of intelligence that is amongst them, otherwise they would have a greater facility in rising from their condition. An intimate acquaintance with them brings you to the knowledge of that. You find great numbers of them incapable of calculating or foreseeing anything. Therefore, there is a lower degree of intelligence, taken generally, amongst them. Still there will be those that have a higher power, and the revised code places a certain degree of literary attainments, if you may dignify it by the name, within the reach of every child that is subject to it and kept to it. Many of them, of course, will forget it in a very short time, because they are careless. It is hard work to impart it to them; it is drilled into them. They will forget it in a short time. Others of a higher intelligence may have learned less in school than they would have learned under the old system; yet as they have the power of mind to improve that which they have got and retain they improve afterwards, and go on improving on it. The amount of education that you can give to a poor man's child in 200 half days in the year such as it is given to great numbers, and in the greatest economy of adult minds brought to bear upon it, must necessarily be very small, and, therefore, much of it must be lost afterwards, and those to whom it may possibly be profitable, will start from the point they have gained there, and acquire, by their own self culture afterwards what it is desirable they should have, the further attainments which is the wish of the country they should possess.

21336. Is it your experience it leads to the practical neglect of dull children?—No, on the contrary, I maintain it is advantageous to the dull children, because they are worked up to a point; the dull children were left behind before. Now, all must be worked up to a point. I have in my own school 219 children presented for examination, with an average attendance of 215, and only five failures out of 457.

21337. Do you think culture, mental elevation, should be kept in view in the rising generation?—Yes, it ought and for this reason—that reading, writing, and arithmetic are only the means for culture. If the child has those three branches imparted to it it has the foundation; now, my idea is, that the only intellectual cultivation you can give to the children of the poor is

a religious and moral training; give them in addition to that one in accordance with sound principle, the means of acquiring more reading, writing, and arithmetic, and if they have the mental power within them it will develop itself afterwards as you would wish.

21338. Should I understand you to say that you do not concern in the following statement of Dr. Merrell—"The watchword of the present day is to pay by results; but if the results we pay for present no available mental growth, it is a serious question whether in afterlife they will not entirely fall of the purpose at which all primary education is supposed to aim—the culture and the elevation of the individual"?—No, I don't believe any great mental growth on matters of science is within the reach of such children as the poorer class of society.

21339. May I ask, in addition to the general religious instruction which pervades the entire of your system, do your teachers give any direct dogmatic teaching in your schools?—They may in the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity—the great leading doctrine,—they may speak of those, but they do not formally give dogmatic instruction, except the name in the girls' schools, who explain the sacraments of religion, the sacraments.

21340. I refer to the teachers in the boys' schools?—They don't; they teach the catechism, and give incidental explanations, but the more formal explanation is given by the clergyman.

21341. May I ask what catechism is read?—The ordinary Catholic catechism of England, a penny catechism, called "The Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine."

21342. Do you occupy in relation to your people the position very much of parish clergymen, though not technically so?—Yes, Missionary Rector of the Church is the ecclesiastical title I hold.

21343. Should I understand that you give to your schools direct religious instruction?—Yes.

21344. How often?—Once a week, besides the Sunday school.

21345. What time do you occupy?—From three to four o'clock each day.

21346. And have you others to assist with yourself?—I have.

21347. What is the character of it?—It is a general address to the whole school; a part of the catechism is taken; if it is the sacraments I explain the number, the reason of the sacraments, so as to make them understood what they have committed to memory.

21348. Is that the amount of the religious instruction given to the children in your school per week?—No, because we have them in the church besides in the evenings.

21349. Mr. Stokes—You have already said there is daily religious instruction?—Yes, you have it shown in the time tables.

21350. Commented by the ordinary teachers?—By the ordinary teachers. The catechism is taught, and explanations are given on it by the religious teachers.

21351. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Should I understand you to say that the ladies connected with convents here, whose schools are under the Board of National Education, labour under a handicap, if in producing a certain result, though not examined as other teachers, they should not have certain benefits?—I don't think I said that, as I understand you to put the question. My answer, if I remember rightly was, that if I consulted the ladies connected with the convents did their work as efficiently as other teachers and were the recognised and preferred teachers by the parents of the children, that it was an injustice towards them to deprive them of that remuneration for the support of their schools which others would receive.

21352. In your answer do you take for granted the religious ladies are the only parties giving instruction in these schools?—That is what I understood to be the case in these schools. I know in some few I have seen in Ireland the schools are attached to and in the convents.

21353. Are you aware the ladies vary in their attainments in these schools, and with a considerable

Dec. 3, 1869

The Very Rev. Laurence Canon Toole

Dec. 5, 1866.  
The Very  
Rev Laurence  
Canon Tools

number attending to give instruction from day to day none may be present more than an hour or two in the day—I don't know that I am speaking of it so I would of our English schools, all other things being equal. I hold that the Government of a country like ours, where there are such various forms of religious belief, should leave us to our own affairs, and not regard ourselves of acting, provided we do not act in a way injurious to the State, and provided we do act beneficially for the State as much as others do.

21374. Mr Stokes.—In England is it not required of religious persons holding certificates and teaching schools, to be as constantly present and employed in their schools as other certificated teachers?—There is no distinction whatever. A nun holding a certificate in England must attend her school to the moment, as well as any other teacher; she may have the same fault found with her, and the same consequences must follow.

21375. Rev Dr Wilson.—Are you aware that in Ireland there is nothing to prevent one of those ladies receiving a first class teacher's certificate, provided she passes the examination?—I don't know the details of the system here, I only know its great leading features.

21376. The ladies occupying similar positions in England conform to the examination rules?—Yes.

21377. And you are aware that in Ireland they do not conform?—Yes.

21378. Are you aware that in Ireland convent schools under the National Board have a large staff of nuns, in addition to the ladies engaged in teaching?—I am not, but I suppose there must necessarily be nuns, or pupil teachers. I don't know the peculiar arrangements.

21379. And that these nuns, or nuns, are remunerated for their services, over and above the capitation grant made to the ladies of the convent?—No, I don't know the details of the system.

21380. May I ask are you aware the capitation grant is made for each child, irrespective of age, attending those convent schools?—No, I am not.

21381. And that in some convent schools children are admitted under three years of age?—That may be; for instance, we have them sometimes in our own school under three years of age—the infant school.

21382. And I understood that some are to be found asleep in a cradle or bed in Ireland?—The French have a very handsome system of schools called crèches, where poor people employed in labour, instead of locking the child into a room at home, take it to the infant school where there is a small bed prepared for it, the mother is relieved from the care of the child and also from anxiety, and the child from all danger. I wish we had such institutions in greater abundance and could afford to keep them.

21383. Are you also aware that while you say in England children leave school at thirteen years of age pupils in Ireland are found in attendance at convent schools above eighteen years of age?—Yes, and I think there is the fallacy of Vice-Pres. argument founded on the figures which you have quoted, and which figures I think should lead to the very opposite conclusion. In the figures you quoted there are included all attending school from even under three years of age up to eighteen years of age, and that with your schools in every part of the country. All these are counted against us, with a population scattered through the country, very few in some places, and in many districts no Catholic school at all, whilst, where we have schools, chiefly in the towns, the children attending them are between the ages of four and thirteen. Unless in the case of an infant school, there are scarcely any under five years of age, and infant schools are very scarce articles with us.

21384. Mr Stokes.—Is there not this further element to be considered, that an "attendance" in an English school requires the presence of a child during a certain number of hours, whereas in Ireland the teacher marks the attendance of the child he presents at all?—Yes, I didn't know that was the system in Ireland.

21385. Rev Dr Wilson.—For the most part your schools are in very large attendance in the case of popu-

lation?—By no means; for one great effort of every parent in England is to have a school attached to his church. Our churches are very few in England, but wherever there is one the first great effort of the parent is to have a school attached to it; he may be too poor to have it in connection with the Committee of Council, but if it is possible to do it he will.

21386. As a matter of fact, are they not the great centres of population which furnish you with large numbers of children for your Catholic schools?—Certainly, because the great body of our people in England are the Irish poor, they are attracted necessarily to the great centres of population, for in them there is a greater variety of employment for themselves and their children.

21387. With us we have so few cities the children are scattered over the island, and many in very backward districts?—That may be. We are few in England, while here the Catholics are the nation.

21388. You are not allowed, I presume, to present any child for examination for payment by results under a certain age?—Six or seven years of age. I think they must be, for examination is the first standard, six years of age.

21389. Do their lordships take any notice of the accommodation necessary for a specific number of children in the school?—Most certainly they require eight square feet, or else eighty cubic feet for each child.

21390. May I ask are they very strict in carrying out these regulations on that subject?—Yes, they are. I have already stated to you the size of the school. The school referred to there was that which is now entirely a boys' school. It was a boys' and girls' school at that time, divided in two. Now the school is sixty-four feet long and forty-five feet wide. The average attendance in that school is 215, whereas I think you will find, by squaring the numbers, it would accommodate between 400 and 500. The girls' school at present, with an average attendance of 140 children, is sixty-two feet long and thirty feet wide, and according to their requirements, will accommodate something like 290; the infant school the same. The infant school is only open one year and three-quarters.

21391. Has your attention been turned at all to the report of Lord Taunton's Commission with regard to middle-class schools in England?—I have the report, but I don't know I have directed my attention particularly to that. One of the Assistant Commissioners was in our neighbourhood, and he applied to me to know if he might examine the ladies' boarding school. We threw it open to him, and it appears he has some remarks on convent boarding-schools in Lancashire. That was Mr. Bryce.

21392. In the religious difficulty, in your opinion, in England is a real or a sentimental one?—I cannot say what you mean by a real or a sentimental difficulty.

21393. Does it involve any practical difficulty as far as the attendance of children in the school is concerned, and receiving education in the different schools?—It must necessarily where there is not a school of the denomination to which a child belongs. If you know anything of England you know that the great bulk of the common people are perfectly indifferent, except there be some no-Popery cry, or something of that kind got up, and then they are exceedingly zealous.

21394. The Commissioners to whom I refer say— "We are confirmed in this opinion by the fact that our evidence appears to show that the difficulty which we are discussing is not nearly so great as it might appear at first sight. There are certainly many schoolmasters who profess themselves unable to manage a school unless the religious instruction is compulsory upon all the scholars, but the great majority of those whom we examined on that point, including some of the best and ablest, appeared to find no practical difficulty in separating from denominational teaching those whose parents drove them to be educated. And Mr. Bryce, after examining carefully into this matter in his district (Lancashire), came to the conclusion that what is commonly called the religious difficulty was

altogether mixed, or one which was generally settled with ease by the exercise of common sense or mutual forbearance. Mr. Stanton reports that in no case did he find any instance of any master, whether he were Churchman or Dissenter, priest or layman, who expressed any but the most tolerant views on this subject, and who did not labour rather to widen than to restrict a restriction. There are, no doubt," say the Commissioners, "occasional cases of harshness, but it does not seem impossible to prevent them by defining the rights of the parent on the one hand, and of the schoolmaster on the other, in such a manner as almost to remove all real ground of grievance." Should you be disposed to concur with the Royal Commissioners and with the gentlemen whose statements are so made, and as which they base their report?—What question do you base on that extract?

21393. Should you be disposed to concur in the propriety of that part of the report of the Commissioners?—As far as it may have appeared to Mr. Bryce, I have no reason whatever to object to it, but you must remember that Mr. Bryce is there speaking merely of the various shades of Protestantism when I am speaking of denominational education. I am speaking of the denominational education of Catholics as contradistinguished from Protestants and the various shades of Dissenters, which I look on as so many species of the same genus. Between Catholics and Protestants I take a great difference, the bones of the two are different, and hence they cannot be blended together.

21394. Are you not aware they held this principle of their report should apply even if all denominations, Protestants and Catholics, attend such schools?—I am, and I don't think it is advantageous. There were not many Roman Catholics amongst these schools. There are the middle class schools, in which there are various shades of Protestantism.

21397. Should you say the right of the parent rests on the principle that he must be responsible for the religious instruction of his child?—Yes, I think the parent is responsible, he has the right of claiming religious education for his children and saying what it ought to be. The State has not any right in that.

21398. And that every child, as a day scholar, should have a right to withdraw from the teaching to which he conscientiously objects?—Yes, and in schools where we are obliged to have a conscience clause, and in consequence of the small number of persons in the neighbourhood professing certain forms of religion, their children are obliged to go to a school of a different denomination. For instance, in some parts of England Catholics and Dissenters in a Church of England school, and in some parts of Ireland, as in the South, Protestants in a Catholic school, and in the North, Catholics in a Protestant school. I should say that it should not merely be a permissive matter for the parent to withdraw his child, but that there should be a compulsion upon the teacher to exempt the child. You must remember that where the poor are in the minority there is a great temptation to yield to the influence of the majority to the violation of their consciences, and thus bring about that want of firmness of mind and respectability of character which we see in too many instances because the massiveness of conscience has been violated so easily and so frequently with mutual advantage.

21399. In your own schools could you so eliminate the religious element from the secular instruction as that the faith of the Protestant child should not be endangered by receiving your religious instruction?—I don't know what danger the faith of the Protestant child might meet, but I could not so eliminate it from the teaching that the Protestant child who was in the school could not hear the instruction. I don't wish to take notice of the child itself, if he does not belong to us, but the child might learn to have afterwards a very different opinion of Catholics from that in which they are usually brought up, ignorance of Catholics, and misrepresentations of Catholics.

21400. Did I understand you to say you approved of a conscience clause in schools for middle class educa-

tion where Catholics could attend?—No, I think the middle class can take care of themselves. I merely ask it for the protection of the poor where they are exposed to temptation from their poverty and the influence of greater wealth and greater numbers of other denominations.

21401. Are there not children of poor Protestants in cities in England as well as of poor Catholics?—Yes, of course.

21402. Should not you be disposed to renounce the conscience clause?—No, for this reason, the same necessity can never arise. In a large city there will be a variety of schools of different denominations to which the denominations can respectively go. I can see no reason for a conscience clause, except in such places where the professors of any form of religion are so few or so poor that they cannot provide for themselves, and therefore are obliged to have recourse to the State-supported schools. In such cases the State should interfere and protect the rights of conscience.

21403. When the late Commission was appointed did the body you represent advise the Commissioners not to inquire into your schools?—Of the body I know nothing. I told you that when I heard that Mr. Bryce applied to the Home Office for permission to visit the schools, I and by all means let him come in, and examine the schools.

21404. I see in the appendix to the report, the first volume, page 680, a correspondence between the Government and the Honorable Charles Longdale?—That is in the poor school inquiry. That is not the one you read from just now.

21405. Did you refuse to admit the parties appointed by this Commission to examine into the state of your schools?—I do not remember at present about that.

21406. Are you aware that the parties representing you refused to receive the gentlemen who were named by the Duke of Newcastle's Commission into your schools for the purpose of examining into their state and efficiency?—I do not remember it, but I am told it was so, but personally I never did. That I can say.

21407. Mr. Sullivan—Your school is not directly connected with the school committee except in getting a grant, as stated, once or twice from that body?—In no way whatsoever.

21408. But the action they would take would not kind you or influence you in any way?—In no way further than if there was a wish expressed by my ecclesiastical superiors, of course I should conform to that.

21409. But as a matter of fact your ecclesiastical superiors did not impose any such wish?—I do not remember it, although I have the whole of the Duke of Newcastle's reports, I never noticed that in it.

21410. Mr. Stoker—Do you not remember that there were no Roman Catholic gentlemen upon that Commission—that the Catholic Poor School Committee made a demand upon the Government for the appointment of a Catholic Commissioner, and when the demand was refused they said the schools should be closed against the Commission?—I do not exactly remember.

21411. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Are you not aware of the following statement on the part of the Government, in explanation of or in reference to the matter—I quote from volume I, page 680 of the appendix to the first report of that Royal Commission—"The instructions to the Assistant Commissioners require upon them in the strongest way a rigid impartiality in collecting facts, and a most entire abstinence from any expression of controversial feeling."—I am not aware of that.

21412. Should you not regret that as satisfactory?—I cannot say, and it is very hard for me to answer from a passage read from a book that way—that I don't remember yet all the circumstances connected with it.

21413. Mr. Stoker—Do you remember by any chance that the Assistant Commissioners were expressly directed to examine as to religion under that Commission?—I do not remember it.

21414. Mr. Gibson—In a district where there is a

Dec. 8, 1868.

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Union Table.

Dec 2, 1868.  
The Very  
Rev. Eugene  
Cullen, D.D.

very large poor population, the majority of one denomination intermixed with a small minority of a different religion.—If I understood you right you said in those districts you think the conscience clause was desirable for the sake of this small poor minority?—I say so, and that not merely a conscience clause, as we have it, proposed and objected to by some—a conscience clause that would entitle a child to be exempted if the parent would require it, but I would have one that when the Protestant child was entered, for instance, in a great Catholic school as a Protestant, where it was necessary to have a conscience clause in consequence of no second school—or when a Catholic was entered in a Protestant school, in like circumstances, I would have it incumbent upon the teacher to exempt the child from direct religious instruction. You cannot exempt him from what would be incidental, from what arises from the looks or the general tone of the place, but I would have him exempt by express order to the teacher, and in the same way with a Catholic in a Protestant place, the mixed system is anything but a mixed system itself, for you never can find a Catholic teacher in a strictly Protestant neighbourhood in the school, nor a Protestant teacher in a Catholic neighbourhood in the school.

21413. Then your exemption extends only to direct religious teaching in the school?—Yes.

21414. But if the system was such that from the ordinary books used in the school it was impossible for the child not to receive religious teaching contrary to that which the parent desired, the child would then be exposed, of course, in such a school to be taught the religion of the majority through the books?—Yes, I hold that to be unavoidable, unless it be to the injury of the majority. That is an accident. I would guard against the accident as much as I could, but I would not feel myself bound to figure the great majority in the religious instruction and training that is due to them for the sake of the minority, and in such a case as that, if it was fairly carried on, I should say the child acquired religious knowledge rather than religious permission, because there would be nothing done to indoctrinate the child except what is inseparable from the doctrine of the school itself.

21415. But by the attendance of a Catholic child in a Protestant school such as you have described, or of a Protestant child in a Catholic school, would the child not necessarily be exposed to have the religious opinions taught it by its parents interfered with?—Yes, substantially.

21416. How could the reading book, for instance the Standard Reading Book, be read by them, the Third Reading Book for instance, without their receiving Catholic doctrinal instruction?—The same way as in the other schools, I say, that appears to be unavoidable.

21417. What was the effect then of the conscience clause in such schools as you speak of?—Is it not quite nugatory so far as preventing religious proselytism?—No, because there may be a special instruction attending the development and enforcing by argument and explanation, or by what might be called argument by illustration, or any other means you please, particular doctrine. It is argued that I would have the conscience clause.

21418. I take it for granted when the children read the ordinary lesson books that they are taught to understand, or that it is the duty of the teacher to explain, what is in these books. It therefore becomes the duty of the Catholic teacher to explain to the Protestant child, being in the majority, the peculiar doctrines of the Catholic religion, so far as they occur in the reading books?—Not to explain to the Protestant child, but to explain in the presence of the Protestant child.

21419. Necessarily the Protestant must learn whatever is taught to the Catholic child?—Yes, and the same way in a Protestant school the Catholic child must be taught Protestant doctrine.

21420. Do you not think it a safer system by which the reading-books of the school could be completely expurgated from matter which would affect

religious feelings of either Protestant or Catholic children?—That is only coming back to the simple secular system, in which you remove the name of God and prayer, and all such things, from the school.

21421. But the conscience clause, according to your statement, appears to me, with great respect, to be completely nugatory, because with that conscience clause you do give religious teaching, not directly but indirectly, so that the child must take it up. Yes, that is what I say, but I cannot see how that is to be avoided under the conscience clause. The grievance is in the great variety of religions, there is what is to be tolerated, but I cannot see that the majority ought to be ignored for the sake of the few. An accident of the kind must be mitigated as much as possible, but cannot be altogether removed.

21422. In a community so exactly balanced that neither of them *per se* could have a school—a distinctive school—in the conscience clause is that one to become nugatory with regard to one or the other, or else does it not amount to a formal altogether of instruction to the child of the parents who do not wish to submit their child to the influence of this indirect teaching?—According to my idea, the objection you make would not apply in such a case at all, because, if the community was so exactly balanced, they would each have a school. The only case in which I see that the conscience clause would be legitimate, and where it would be so advisable, is, where there is a preponderating majority of one religion, and the other unable to provide themselves; but whenever it should come that the others should be able to provide themselves with a school, then I think they should have a school also.

21423. Do you think that a conscientious parent, Roman Catholic or Protestant, could avail himself of a school having such a conscience clause, knowing that his child should be exposed to learn doctrines to which the parent had a conscientious objection?—I do know that, that there are parents obliged at present to send their children to such schools without the protection of a conscience clause. In how many parts of England are there where Catholics are few in number—suppose five, ten, or fifteen Catholic families in the parish, and there is no school except a school attached to the Established Church, and there is no situation for the children except what they get there, and there is no conscience clause—it is a grievance of their position, but I do not see how human law could relieve them from the grievance of their position there, without doing the injury to the children of the majority, by preventing them getting religious instruction, according to the religion of their own parents and the character of the place.

21424. Do you not think it the duty of the State to take care that every child belonging to the State should be able to receive secular instruction without having his religious opinions interfered with?—I think it is the duty of the State not to do anything to interfere with religion, and to protect them as far as possible; but that is one protection in every case, even to the extreme of indirect teaching, I think that an impossibility. You might as well stop the principle at once as attempt to do it.

21425. But this conscience clause which I was accustomed to think, in England amounted to protection, appears to me, according to what you have explained, to be no protection, so far as the books are concerned of the school, which are quite doctrinal, and teach the child doctrinal doctrine?—I have already said there was a difficulty there, but I could not say, without injury to the greater number, I object because I hold religious training to be a very important thing—most important. I cannot see any way of remedying that, going beyond the direct religious teaching, without doing an injury to the greater number.

21426. And then, suppose the country were divided unequally, and there was a large majority Catholic, and a small minority Protestant, or the great majority Protestant, and the small minority Catholic, or that principle the conscience clause being in all the

schools, and each school teaching distinctive religious doctrine in its books, each child of a minority would be actually exposed to have its religious opinions interfered with necessarily, as a matter of necessity, under the system which you think is absolutely unavoidable?—But, after all, then it would depend upon the conduct of the teachers. The very case you suppose is a real one, it is a real one in France—in Rhenish Prussia. The great majority of the people there are Catholics, and the schools are Catholic, and are in the hands of Catholic teachers; but the Protestant children attending them are exempt by law from attendance upon religious instruction. It is in their books and ordinary daily life a child sees and knows what is going on amongst the Catholic children, but the religious instruction of the child is not interfered with. When the Protestants of that place become numerous enough to have a school for themselves, it is provided for them. The case exists already there. The same thing exists in Protestant Prussia, the Catholics are in a minority in many places. The State provides a school for the majority, and they have a Protestant master; and if the time comes round when they require by the law a school, that school is provided for the Catholics. The Catholic children go to it till such time as they are able to have a school for themselves. Those things are inevitable. I cannot see that religion is to be shut out from the poor, or that minorities are to be deprived of that to which they are entitled for the sake of the majority.

21429. But with great respect, the question is not whether the religion should be shut out altogether. That is not the question, with great respect; but the question whether religion should be taught at all times. Under your system it is taught at all times, for it is taught in your books, which constitute the daily psalm of your schools, and it is taught especially at particular times, when the children get religious training, so that at all times you speak of there is religious instruction, but in the schools affording proper protection, the religious instruction is confined to particular times, not apart, so that the question is not whether we are to have no religious education at all?—If we were to argue the matter we should not agree there, because my idea of religious training are not limited merely to the religious instruction of children. I could give you my idea of religious training in a little paper I have. I consider it is a part of the business of the school altogether, to train children religiously.

21430. Mr. Stokes.—Have you any experience of Catholic schools in England worked under the conscience clause?—No, I would advocate it is a good national system, but there is no conscience clause applied in England, so far as I know, except to the Church of England, in looking for building grants in such cases as that we speak of.

21431. The Chairman.—I believe there is a Roman Catholic school at Talacre, in Flintshire, with a conscience clause. Do you know anything of that one, and is that an exceptional one?—I do not know of it, and if it be it must be an exceptional one. I know that, that of the Congress of the Social Science Association, held in Manchester, the subject of the conscience clause was spoken of by Owen Danford, of the Manchester Cathedral. He complained of its application to the Church of England alone, and wanted to know why Wesleyan Methodists and Roman Catholics were not subjected to it also. Mr. Sturt, the Chairman of the Educational Department, gave this as the reason. You claim, he said, to be the National Church, and to have the education of the nation entrusted to your hands. You have no right to indoctrinate the children of the fever of the power of other religious denominations that may be mixed up with you. On the other hand, the Wesleyan Methodists and the Roman Catholics, when they build a school, build it for their own denomination, and, therefore, it would not be fair to impose such an obligation on them. If you claim to be just upon a level with them yourself, in what you consider

a disability, you bring yourselves down to a level with them as mere sects in the State. I do not remember the case you allude to, and it must have been an entirely voluntary act on the part of the managers, whomsoever they may be.

21432. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you approve of a great national scheme such as that indicated by you in the answer, with a conscience clause?—In such cases.

21433. For all England?—I could not approve of it in large towns where there is every opportunity of children going to school exactly belonging to their own denomination.

21434. Are you opposed to a system of united education?—Yes, I am.

21435. On principles which will fairly protect religious denominations?—I do not think there are such principles.

21436. Although you receive State aid for the support of the Roman Catholic schools out of a common fund contributed to by other denominations?—We receive no more than any other denominations. We receive it on the same terms.

21437. Master Brooke.—If there be such an exception as you suggest, the conscience clause in such a case would exempt a poor Protestant child from a lesson in your Catechism?—Yes.

21438. And that alone?—Yes.

21439. In such a school as that would you consider it necessary to entirely denude that series of books which is penetrated with that Roman Catholic doctrine, and adapt some series free from the mixture?—I think that the question you put is already answered in practice, it has just occurred to me in our workhouse. In our workhouse the Catholic element, is of considerable minority. When a child is entered in the workhouse the word Catholic or Protestant, as the case may be, is put opposite its name. The Catholic child has to take its chance amongst the Protestant element in the school, but it is exempted from direct religious teaching, and from going to church services, and so on, so that the conscience clause is really there in existence. The books there are so much, if I might use the word, impregnated with Protestant principles, as those of which we are speaking are impregnated with Catholic principles, and the Catholic child takes its chance amongst them and is in an unfavorable position, but I do not think we have a right to insist that the Protestant children shall not have their religious education for the sake of the Catholic children—we see, I may say, as an unfortunate position, and we must only make the best of it, and hope for better times.

21440. Mr. Wilson.—And these children are in danger of proselytism?—Most undoubtedly; and the next we can do is to mitigate the evil as we try to mitigate every evil that permeates society.

21441. The Chairman.—But you consider that a sort of involuntary proselytism?—It may be, directly or not. It may be so to an extent. I hold that in mixed education, an indifference to religious doctrine and religious dogmas is the consequence of it. Now, as I do believe there is religious truth I hold there ought not to be an indifference to dogma or to doctrine. If there be no truth, if they tell me there is to be no good taken of dogma at all there is no such thing as truth. If there be no such thing as truth, what is all the noise about. But I do maintain that there is positive religious truth, therefore dogma, and therefore it is necessary to be incalculable upon those who have to believe in. Mixed education undermines what is the basis of all religion, because faith and belief is the foundation and source of all religion. If you once destroy that, religion is merely a matter of fancy dependent upon any person's conviction or habit.

21442. Mr. Wilson.—There are six days in the week during which men go about their ordinary business, and there is one day in the week, the seventh, which is specially, by the Divine appointment, devoted to religion. Do you think it is contrary to that principle that men, in the course of imparting education, shall

Dec. 3, 1882.  
—  
The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Casson Took

Dec 5, 1885  
The Very  
Rev Laurence  
Cahill, Dean

set apart a certain time for dogmatic teaching—for teaching what is truth, but not dogmatic truth—teaching the truths of science—teaching the truths connected with general knowledge, and yet, that during the day there should be a certain time set apart for distinct dogmatic teaching. Does that argue indifference? Does it not rather say there is a time when you are to learn arithmetic, and learn writing, and learn mathematics, and a special time to be set apart to special teaching—admitting that there is nothing to be taught contrary from any writing—but I set apart a particular time of the day to distinct religious teaching, do we, therefore, show indifference to religion?—I do think that you produce an indifference in the mind of youth by it, because, although there be six days for labour and one day for rest, and one day for the special service of Almighty God, there are not six days to be devoted to the world and only one to God. As youth is, or ought to be, the time of education, and training, and of the development of the mind, and commencing and preparing the mind for what he is to be afterwards, I do think it ought not to be indoctrinated upon him from the very beginning that he is only to think of God upon one day of the week, and that his duty to Him does not enter into his every hour of life, and when I said dogmatic teaching, I did not mean to make it appear that the whole teaching of religion consists in dogma, it is the foundation, it is the first part of it as it were. I use the argument to show the necessity of attending to it if we believe there is such a thing as religion, and as truth, and such a thing as falsehood.

21441. Mr. Deane.—How are your teachers paid? I mean to say are they paid through the managers—or do they receive their money direct from head quarters?—No, through the managers—I pay the head master £110 a year.

21442. Is that portion of what is paid to the teachers by the State sent to you and transmitted by you to the teachers?—There is no part paid directly by the State to the teachers, as the ordinary process is, we are paid by results—so much for the average attendance of the children, and so much for the results of their examination. That comes into the school fund, and whatever that may be, I must provide the teacher's salary. That goes so much towards teaching and so much towards the expenses of the school.

21443. Does it make no difference in the amount of payment the teacher gets whether there has been a good result of the examination or a bad result?—It makes no difference whatsoever, except in this respect, that if it is a bad result we discharge the teacher.

21444. Mr. Sullivan.—What do you pay your second teachers?—£75 a year. £110 to the first master and £75 a year to the second master, and the pupil-teachers of five years' apprenticeship range from £10 to £30, increasing £2 10s each year.

21445. Mr. Deane.—Then the State does not deal with the teacher but with the manager?—Yes; it simply deals with the managers.

21446. And pays the manager a certain sum of money, if a certain educational result is produced?—Yes.

21447. And if the educational result produced in the school does not amount to the same money value as the money to be given to the teacher, you or the local parties suffer for it?—Yes; and the Committee of Council require a certain staff, not only a mean of a certain size for a certain number, but a certain teaching staff to be kept up as the minimum, and if you have not got that staff they deduct so much from you. For instance, in last year, the first year of the infant school, we had not pupil-teachers, and therefore the object was to have competent persons who will pass their examination for pupil-teachers. If we got them, and they successfully pass their examination at the end of the year they count as pupil-teachers. If not, and we have not a sufficient number of qualified persons, then we lose so much of the grant. One of the girls failed in her examination for which we had £7 10s deducted, for although she was idle and careless, we paid her as a teacher during the year, but

because she was idle and careless she failed in her examination and we suffered a loss of £7 10s.

21448. In the girls' school taught by nuns is the mode of payment exactly the same?—Yes. So much a year.

21449. And your relations to them as teachers are the same as your relations to the male teachers?—Just the same, and they have the same obligation of attendance. They must be certificated teachers, and if we have, as we often have, an assistant who is not certificated from the State, she does not count in the Government estimate at all and she is entirely unremunerated. For instance, where the teaching staff was of the number required by the conditions of the Committee of Council any number of nuns who were teaching as assistants would be so much additional assistance to the schools, but no additional advantage with respect to the grant.

21450. Are nuns ever paid for in nuns' schools?—We have pupil-teachers there. There is no difference between the school taught by nuns and any other school, except the nun's dress—her skill in teaching and her dress. The books and all the duties she has to go through, the same duties, the same hours as if she were an ordinary teacher.

21451. Is there a special grant under the English system for pupil-teachers in nuns' schools?—No; there is no recognition of nuns on the part of the Council at all. They do not know of their existence. She may be Sister anything you please, but before the Council she is only Mary Smith.

21452. Do you get any advantages from the State in the way of books or school requisites?—Not now. Formerly we received book grants, but they have been discontinued and when we received book grants we had the same freedom in the selection of books that we have at present. The Committee of Council issued a list of books any of which you might order, and these Catholic books are put upon the list amongst the others. Some schools might take them, and others might not, when they did give grants, but now they do not.

21453. You described certain religious practices as taking place in your schools at stated hours. Are not those religious practices similar to what are in use in the Catholic colleges, at which the sons of the higher classes of English and Irish Catholics are educated?—Just the same.

21454. These are practices that the educated Catholics, who pay for the education of their own children, think desirable in the education of Catholic youth?—Yes, it is merely a recollection of the presence of God, reminded by the passing of time, when the clock strikes.

21455. The Chairmen.—Do the Protestant children in these schools join in making the sign of the cross when the clock strikes?—I do not think they do. We should not regret them. I don't think they take that much notice, but I always found that any Protestants from Ireland always knew how to make the sign of the cross, and say the *Hail Mary*. In England they know nothing about it.

21456. Mr. Sullivan.—Does the State make any advance for building schools?—When persons make an application for funds for building schools they can have them, but the schools I have are built upon the property belonging to the Church, and, therefore, I did not undertake to make a conveyance of the land, or put it into the power of the State, so that it could be at any time claimed on the ground of public money having been paid for it.

21457. What conditions does the State impose upon managers of schools who ask for building grants?—They must, in the first place, approve of the site, and see that there is a necessity for the school in the neighbourhood, and a necessity for the school for that denomination in the neighbourhood. Hence, if I were to undertake and build a Catholic school in any part of Manchester, where it was well known there was scarcely a poor Catholic residing, and applied for public money so that it would be refused. In the next place they must be satisfied with the tenure of the

lead, with the quality of the building, and all this must be settled before the grant is made. Then the grant given, I think, is 3s 6d per square foot for the accommodation.

21449. That is a given sum?—A given sum. Formerly they gave 4s. per square foot, but now it is only 3s 6d.

21451. What firm does the State hold over a school built in that way?—None whatever. It is vested in trustees, and is controlled.

21452. The Chairmen.—When schools are conveyed to trustees, is not the dedication of the property to educational purposes secured in perpetuity?—Yes, that is what I say by trust deed, and the trust-deed is registered, but the State claims no proprietorship in it.

21453. Mr. Sullivan.—Is there any covenant in the lease for keeping the school in repair?—I suppose there is, but as I never built under a Government grant, I cannot speak of the details of the lease.

21454. Are you aware whether in such a lease there is any clause connected with the religious observance of the school?—There is none. I suppose it would be specified to what denomination the school belongs.

21455. I think you stated you enjoyed perfect religious freedom in the schools?—Yes.

21456. Is there any rule laid by the rules of the Committee of Council for religious instruction?—No, that is entirely by our own arrangement.

21457. The State, in fact, knows nothing of it?—Knows nothing of it.

21458. Then, the Inspectors make no inquiries whatever upon the subject?—None.

21459. Now, with respect to the application of the denominational system to country places, where the population is sparse, and where the number of people belonging to any one particular denomination may not be sufficient to form a school, how would you meet the case?—In England that is necessarily the case with reference to the Church of England, because there is a church, and pretty nearly a school, I suppose, in every parish in England; whilst the Catholics are in some places so few that they are, perhaps, obliged from a chapel, and have no school, and, therefore, they must and do go to the Protestant school. I say in such cases I would have protection for them against direct religious teaching. I should not expect or suppose that the whole of the religious teaching that might be indirectly in the elements of the school books should be shut out from the poor Protestants of the Church of England, namely because there were five, six, or ten Catholics there, but that those Catholics should be exempted from what I term direct religious teaching. And the same thing should be done in other similar cases. If, for instance, the denominational system was established in Ireland, and if in the South of Ireland there were a few Protestant poor not able to provide themselves with a school, and obliged to go to a Catholic school, or be without education, they should have the same protection there.

21470. Under the circumstances pointed out, would you be satisfied with such a conscience clause with regard to direct teaching?—Yes, I would; because I hold the principle of doing as I wish to be done by.

21471. How would you meet the argument which is sometimes urged, that the religious instruction is a question for the parents and to be conducted at home, and not a portion of ordinary school business—how would you meet that in the case of children of poor parents?—By the fact that it is not done at home amongst the poor, and that in the constant daily employments and cares of life it is all but impossible that it should be. With too many there is nothing of religious teaching, as we see and know, by the lives they lead; there is, therefore, no other means of religious teaching, or teaching, or discipline for the children of those poor except that which they get in school. In the families of the wealthy they do not depend upon school for religious teaching, and yet they are most unwilling to subject their children to the risks of the mixed system, still they have a home teaching. There is, again, a literature for the children of the wealthy, there is even now coming out a child's Bible for the

children of the wealthy, but for the children of the poor there is no teaching except what there is in the school. It takes so many years, and so much depends upon the character, as to the son or daughter of a respectable man, on the good domestic teaching he or she may have had when young, what is the poor man's child to depend upon for that training? His passions are as strong, his temptations are as great, indeed they are more so than those of the other child; therefore, unless you supply the want, that the condition of our society has brought upon the poor, of religious teaching, unless you supply it in the schools, there is no other means for it, and half an hour in the day merely for such teaching, leaving religion out of consideration at all other times, or appearing to eliminate it altogether at other times, is not sufficient.

21472. Is not the moral training of the great mass of the poor population entirely or almost entirely dependent upon or connected with the religious training they receive?—Most certainly it is so; religious training is to the poor, moral training, and science, and intellectual expansion, and intellectual development, and all else that others derive from so many other sources. Religion is the only abstract or spiritual source that you can bring to bear upon their minds. It has been held, I know, by some, that you cannot impart religious instruction to them; well, I find there is a Mr. Gibbs, an inspector of that name, I think, who in his year's report says he has found out that it is not impossible to teach children religion. Well, we have all known that; I learned it myself when I was a child. It is not impossible to teach it to a child, and it is the only abstract source on which you can really base intellectual expansion for the children of the poor.

21473. Do you think you can so far separate dogmatic religious teaching from the moral teaching for the poor in the schools as is done in the National system of Ireland?—I do not think it at all desirable, on the contrary, I think it exceedingly fallacious, because the whole of the moral system must rest upon dogma, and to teach science or any branch of knowledge without teaching the basis upon which it rests is a fallacy, and therefore the very foundation of it is dogma, because it is in that religious truth consists. Why is there such a variety of religions except that it is taken for granted there is religious truth. If it is a matter of indifference, all the rest is mere chance; it is merely a civil service.

21474. With reference to a statement you made that you preferred a system of National education free for the poor, I wish to ask you where would you draw the line of demarcation between those who should pay and those who should not?—That which is drawn at present, when there are persons labouring with their heads, or of such humble circumstances in life that they are not in moment need higher than those labouring with their hands. I think I explained that already.

21475. Would you propose to combine the class who pay nothing with the class who pay a small sum in the same schools?—Well, I do not think that could be done, because where there are two extremes of society they do not mix together. Schools for these capable of paying would not have to be provided, they can always provide for themselves. For instance, the estimated expense in the public schools in England is 30s., taken generally. That is supposed to be covered by 9d. a week. If a person can pay 9d. a week for children he can provide a school easily, but at it is for the children who cannot afford to pay more than 1s. to 3s. that I would provide. It is those I would have exempted, because I would have a National rate made for the purpose of providing education for the poor and those who are not capable of paying for their children in a superior school where they would have to pay 9d. to 1s. a week—should have the education provided for them out of those taxes, and allow them to be as much entitled to the education that they receive there, and to the protection of the school, as they are entitled to the protection of the police and of the army for the taxes which they pay already. They themselves would be contributors.

21476. Would you call upon the State to contribute

Dec. 5, 1880.  
The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Crooke, Esq.

Dec. 3, 1905.

The Very  
Hon. Laurence  
Casson, Esq.

anything in aid of the education of those who could pay nine pence a week?—No; I would not propose to do so.

21477. Do you know the system of *liberish Prussia*?—No, except from having read Mr. Kay's letters on the subject; I know it from that, but I do not know anything more than that, but one of my fellow-clergymen in Manchester is a German from *liberish Prussia*. He told me something connected with it, but no particulars. In Prussia and in Switzerland, poor as it is, they seem to undertake the whole expense of educating the people.

21478. That is by a local rate?—I think so.

21479. In anything done in the education of priests for the English missions to make them conversant with school matters, as is done in the German schools?—No; nothing.

21480. Do you think that would be desirable?—I think it would be very desirable. Unless a person has a particular fancy for it or a liking for it it is very great drudgery.

21481. With regard to our books, do you think it is desirable that all the books in the schools of a nation should be the same?—No; I don't think it would be desirable they should have one type of mind everywhere.

21482. Do you think it is disadvantageous to have only one set of books?—I do.

21483. Point out what you consider the evil of only one set of books?—You would have only one type of mind, one set of subjects alone known amongst the young, and whenever they heard an opinion expressed by anyone they would hear nothing but what they themselves had learned in the schools. Speaking of hunting insects, I think it is a most effective way of doing it, as far as school books could do it.

21484. Has it not also a very great effect in limiting the production of good school books, and preventing improvement in the methods of teaching to have only one set of school books stereotyped?—Yes, I think it is injurious to the production of books. Were the competition or integrity of skilled teachers allowed to find expression we would have a chance of much better books. I have no objection in addition to the ordinary books to take books from any source, provided there is nothing anti-Catholic in them.

21485. You stated that you used the books of the National Board in your school formerly?—Yes.

21486. And found them inferior to the books you use now?—Yes.

21487. In what way?—They were not as interesting to the children. To me a common expression with reference to books—they were dry.

21488. Are not the selections in the class books of the National Board rather above the intellectual status of the children under eleven years of age, as a rule?—Yes, many of them are.

21489. Have you had any experience of their use in the schools?—Have you personal experience as to the difficulty of the children understanding them?—No; I think not.

21490. Are you aware that the Prussian Government have followed your system, and have put an end to all externs in from what are called the classical authors, in consequence of the inability of the children to learn to read from them?—No, I am not.

21491. I think you stated the children could not read in the school after thirteen years of age?—Yes.

21492. If they choose to remain in the school, and their parents are prepared to pay for them, would the managers of the school offer any objection?—No, only they cannot be examined. There is a sort of additional class, a sort of seventh standard lately admitted, but I do not know the exact bearing of it. We have come up to that, but ordinarily, up to the adoption of that seventh class, they could not be presented for examination, and, therefore, there would be no Government allowance for them.

21493. So that the school would, under those circumstances, be unable to keep them?—Be unable to keep them—that is if there was a number of such.

21494. If a few boys showed considerable aptitude, showed very superior talent, there would be no objec-

tion to their remaining in the school, provided they made up what the Government grants would supply for others?—Yes, or even without that. That is frequently the case where a boy leaves school and gets a situation, then leaves that situation and comes back to school again. He keeps up the little he has learned, and sometimes pays and sometimes does not pay.

21495. How is the present system—taking the period of leaving the school at eleven or twelve—how far is the present system successful in enabling a large number of those who have passed through it, to read, on leaving the school?—On leaving the school every child knows how to read according to the standard it is in. The present Revised Code is so short a time in operation, that it is hardly to be said to have passed over a school life, but every child that passes at the end of a year, is able to read at the end of the year according to the standard it is in, and next year at the next standard, and so on.

21496. In the six standards, when would you say a child would be possessed of a sufficient knowledge of reading, to take delight in reading ordinary books or newspapers?—The fourth or fifth, but for newspapers they would require the sixth standard.

21497. With regard to the question put to you by another Commissioner, as to the small number of Catholics in the schools in England, is it not the fact that the Catholic churches are generally to be found in the great centres of population, and where only there are Catholic schools?—Oh no, because through the country there are many Catholic churches, through Lancashire, and in many small country places. Of course, a great number of them, and the great churches, are all in the large towns, but all through the country there are numbers of churches.

21498. I speak of England as a whole?—Yes; in some countries there are scarcely any.

21499. Be that the returns for Catholic schools rather refer to the great centres of population than to England as a whole?—Yes, and these returns, according to the statement which was quoted here, must put our position most unfavourably, for in taking the whole of the actual attendance, we merely count an average day's attendance, and these are contrasted with the numbers of what we should call present at all in the Irish schools.

21500. In Ireland they only take the average attendance (however, and it was only the average attendance in Ireland that was compared. But in England to be compared to Ireland, where there is scarcely a parish without a school?—The circumstances are so widely different, that there would be no possibility of fair comparison.

21501. Does it not require a certain density of population, and a certain amount of wealth in the locality, to enable the Catholics to get up a school?—Certainly.

21502. So that a large number of Catholics may be scattered through other schools in various districts, and yet are not counted in that average?—Yes.

21503. And who would be likely to attend Catholic schools if established?—Most gladly would attend them.

21504. From that point of view no argument can be drawn as to the desire of the people for one system rather than another?—No, I consider that a fallacy.

21505. Mr. Stobbs—Did not the Catholic population in England suddenly increase about the time of the Irish famine?—Yes, and decreased afterwards.

21506. Were not the Catholic clergy and laity of England suddenly called upon at that time to build a number of school-houses and churches, at a rate which they could not meet without spreading their exertions over a great number of years?—Yes, they were, and the influx from Ireland has been a great pressure upon us always.

21507. Is not the number of schools constantly on the increase still?—Yes.

21508. With regard to a school built with a grant from the Privy Council, can you say whether the trust deed of such a school does not include a man-



agement clause, providing for the management of that school?—I cannot say, as I did not take any building grant. I am not conversant with the details of the deed.

21509. Do you remember that the management clause of such a lease or deed provides for a School Committee, of which the priest holding faculties for the bishop, is ex-officio chairman, that that committee appoints and dismisses the teachers, but that the priest has power to suspend any teacher upon any moral or religious ground, and to remove any book from use in the school of his own authority, with an appeal to the superior ecclesiastical officer?—I believe there is some regulation of that kind, but I am not conversant with it. I was just going to say that in my school there are two managers besides myself, but still all the appointments are in my own hands, and I may get inspection perhaps.

21510. In the inspection of Catholic schools in England denominational?—No, the inspection is not denominational.

21511. Are your schools open to inspection?—No; except by our own Inspectors, appointed by the Committee of Council and approved of by the Bishop.

21512. Does not that regulation make the inspection denominational?—In that sense it makes it denominational, that there are none admitted to our schools except Catholic Inspectors approved of.

21513. Do you consider that in working a system in which the Government merely takes cognizance of the secular part of the instruction, it is necessary to appoint denominational Inspectors?—I should think in our state of society, for our interests, it would be highly so.

21514. Do you think your denominational Inspectors are not as strict in reporting or reflecting on anything amiss in your school as any other officers of the same class would be?—We sometimes think they are more strict—that they show less mercy to us.

21515. Why do you think it important to obtain that provision?—Because I think that in our state of society there is so much of what I would call vulgar prejudice against us—such a tendency on the part of those who are not acquainted with us, to see things in a wrong light, and understand things in a wrong way, that we should be liable to all sorts of misrepresentation, or else, on the other hand, be so partially passed over that we should not be kept closely enough to our duties.

21516. How your experience of Protestant gentlemen employed in similar duties, such as Mr. Bryce, for example, led you to suppose you would experience any difficulty in working your school if it was inspected by an officer who did not belong to the Catholic Church?—Mr. Bryce was the only one I became acquainted with in that capacity, and Mr. Bryce taking a favour might be different from a person coming in a right, and who would not be of the same courteous disposition.

21517. Did your school receive aid from the Manchester and Salford Educational Aid Society?—Several of the children were partially paid for.

21518. Did not that payment confer upon the Society a right to visit your schools?—No, to go into the schools and ask if the children whose names were on their books attended.

21519. Were the officers who visited on the part of the Society Roman Catholics?—No, they were merely messengers sent to ask a question. They had no authority except to receive an answer. They had no right of inspection or examination. It was a condition that they were to comply with the conditions of the Privy Council with reference to inspection. If the Educational Aid Society gave support to a school not under the Council, they claimed the right of inspection and examination, but when the schools were under the Privy Council Committee, we objected, unless they accepted the decisions of Her Majesty's Inspectors, and therefore the only persons who ever came from the Society were messengers, to inquire whether such and such children attended or not.

21520. Did you ever hear of cases in which managers of Catholic schools found difficulties to arise from inspection by Protestants of the Education Aid Society?—No.

21521. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you ever heard that in this country Protestant Inspectors are quite pleasing, so far as the discharge of their duties is concerned, to the managers of another faith?—I have never heard anything on the subject.

21522. Have you any experience of Protestant Inspectors?—No.

21523. Your Inspectors are all Roman Catholics?—Yes.

21524. And must be approved of?—Yes, by the Bishop—by the Catholic Poor School Committee.

21525. Does the State in no way take cognizance of their fitness for their office?—The State appoints them.

21526. Must they be previously approved?—No, subsequently.

21527. The Chairman.—Do members of male monastic orders pass examinations in England as teachers?—Yes; there are only two monastic orders of teachers. One, the Christian Brothers, that you have here in Ireland, but they will not submit to examination, and therefore they never can become extensively employed in England. We could not carry on schools such as we have without Government aid, and as the Christian Brothers will not submit to examinations they cannot be employed. The others are a Belgian Brotherhood that came over here, and I believe that they, of course, felt under disadvantages on account of the language, when they came here; but some of them, I believe, have lately taken certificates.

21528. Mr. Stokes.—Did you ever hear that the Marist Brothers, the Presentation Brothers, and the Brothers of Charity, have undergone examination?—Not that I know. They are not in my neighbourhood, I am speaking of those in my neighbourhood. There is an Irish Christian brotherhood there for over forty years; but they never took certificates, and never were under Government.

21529. In stating there are only two religious communities, you must be understood to confine your observations to Manchester and neighbourhood?—Yes.

21530. The Chairman.—When you speak of persons who work for their livelihood with their hands being entitled to get education for their children free, do you extend that to the skilled artisans receiving high wages?—Yes, because there is a difficulty that has not been alluded to, with regard to a family. These men may easily pay for one child, but if they have four, or five, or six, it becomes a heavy matter to pay for all. They might be able to pay for one, and yet not be able to pay sufficient remuneration for the support of a school for four or five children.

21531. Would you propose that none should be asked to pay who are unable to pay for a week?—I propose that none who are not able to pay should be asked to pay, who claim to be exempt.

21532. Mr. Sedgwick.—In case of a fitter at an engine shop, or a moulder or iron puddler, or any of those persons who earn high wages, are they not much better off than clerks and persons who are said to occupy a superior position in society?—I suppose in many instances they are, puddlers especially, and they would be able to pay.

21533. Yet, if you were to draw the distinction from labour, you would include them in the non-paying class, and exclude those with lower salaries or wages who do not use their hands, except with the pen?—I should consider a poor clerk as much entitled to exemption from payment as the field labourer.

21534. I understood you to mean labour by the hands?—Yes, or persons receiving remuneration only, such as labour by the hands would earn.

21535. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are there not some professional men who are expected to maintain a good position in society whose payment is not equal to that of the moulder?—Unfortunately there are, but often

Dec. 5, 1869  
The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Casson Took.

*Dec 2, 1866.*  
*The Very*  
*Rev Laurence*  
*Cannock*

such a man has more to spare in the end than the number has.

21536 *The Chairman*.—Do you consider that payment by results has a tendency to lead to cramming in a school?—No, they cannot cram, because the children they have to deal with will not be crammed. It is nothing but constant training and hard work that can make them up for it. There is no such thing as neglecting the children one half of the year and then cramming the other half. Boys or girls will not be crammed in the first place, and in the next place teachers would have double trouble. They could not do it. I do not know any instance of over-exhaustion. They change the quality of the work in some degree. For instance, the examination of the upper class is in writing. A child has a blank sheet of paper, and a sum is put before it in arithmetic, and it is required to work this upon paper without having a slate or a second copy, in order to acquire habits of reasoning, so of course we cannot go to the expense of paper all the year round, several quires of paper are divided, and they work on it for some weeks before, in order that they may be skilled in putting down neatly upon the paper the work at the examination. That is the only form of cramming we adopt.

21537 If it be objected before us against a proposal to introduce some sort of payment by results in Ireland, that it has a tendency to produce cramming in a school, should you consent with or dissent from that conclusion?—Dissent from it. If the examination be such as we have, they could not cram.

21538 *Mr. Sullivan*.—But would it not be a very good thing to cram, so as to enable them to read and write?—I would call it cramming for a child to get a passage off by heart.

21539 I mean reading, such as the Inspector would require, or writing well from dictation. Would not that be a desirable object whatever way it was attained?—That would be learning.

21540 I intended to ask you a question with regard to the examination of nuns and the members of religious orders. Do you see any real objection to it in case the teachers were to be paid, not only by the results, but also by a fixed salary?—I think it could be done very satisfactorily. It appears to me if the examination was made in writing, so the examination is conducted with us, and especially if the Inspector who superintended the examination did not require them to leave their convents. I know there must be an additional difficulty in Ireland from what we have in England. The religious teaching order have expressly instituted for the poor as the order of the Presentation. They have vows of enclosure, and they cannot leave their convents without special permission, and it is very much against their will. If therefore the Inspector who makes his visit should take his papers over and give such a time for the answering of the question, it appears to me there could be no objection whatever to them taking a certificate. But if they have to go into a room into the presence of a number of persons to write partly and be examined orally in other parts, it would be highly objectionable; and they would not, I think, submit to it, but I think in doing a great and good work as they do by training the children here, it is a very great pity they have not some facilities given to them for obtaining a qualification, and that they are not on a level to the same examination as any other person.

21541 Is there not this difficulty in carrying out a large measure by the State—that if the member who administers it makes an exception in favour of one body it breaks down his rule, and he has to make exceptions in cases where it would be injudicious to do so?—Of course, that is one of the difficulties of legislation always, but that being no great element in the education of this country, and so careful, and this country being so peculiarly circumstanced I do not see any other case which could be effected by an exception of that sort.

21542 *The Chairman*.—Would it be consistent with the regulations of that body for the members of

several houses to come together for examination, so as to save a waste of labour and time on the part of the Inspectors in examining two or three individuals in different places?—That occurred to me in giving the previous answer, but I did not like to volunteer an answer, knowing so little about it. It appears to me it would be easy to obtain a dispensation for the purpose of letting a number of such religious order be assembled together as in England, and there be examined with that due regard to their feelings and their position that they desire.

21543 *Mr. Stoker*.—Would you think it a wise regulation to put at once upon the list of qualified teachers all the religious above a certain age who were certified either by the Inspectors or other competent authority to have been usefully engaged in schools as teachers of primary education for a certain number of years?—I should certainly say it is one of the best titles to a certificate they could show.

21544 Then you think if that were done all younger members without any handicap might pass examinations, such as you describe within the walls of their own houses?—Yes, and in such a way as the Chairman has mentioned.

21545 *Mr. Sullivan*.—I think I gathered from you that in England there is no recognition of the religious character of the masters or mistresses of the schools?—None whatever.

21546 Do you think it would be desirable that in Ireland also, members of religious communities should be examined, so as to place them on a footing of equality with other teachers, and not have their competency called in question because of their religious character?—I could hardly answer that question, for, as I said before, there are such exceptional circumstances here that I do not know how far exceptional provision for them could be made.

21547 I am speaking as to the general principle, as to whether it would not be desirable to get rid of all objections on the score of their religious character by placing them on the same footing as other teachers?—I am confident they could not do it. Ladies accustomed to the retired life they lead, and to the form of life could not go into a room and be subjected to the examination. The examinations here are not exclusively in writing.

21548 That is a question of detail, and not principle?—Yes.

21549 *Mr. Stoker*.—Among the schoolmasters who suffered from such a panic at the introduction of the revised code, do you think the indolent and inefficient men are now selected with their position under the system of payment by results?—I should think so. I know my master is pleased with it, and would not have a change on any account.

21550 Is it your opinion that the deserving men have suffered a loss by the change?—I do not know. I only know the salary of some went up.

21551 *Rev. Dr. Wilson*.—As to the religious ladies, do they not make a special vow to teach as part of their duty?—Different orders are instituted for different purposes. The one I have in their vow have devoted themselves to the education of youth. They were instituted originally in the reign of James the First, and the order has lived on from that time to the present. Instituted by an English lady for the purpose of extending the benefit of education to young ladies, and hence until they came to me they never were employed in the instruction of the poor, except when Cardinal Cullen required them to have schools in Duleek, near Dublin, and now they have one at Rathfriland, and he required them to keep poor schools as well as boarding schools in other places. But the Sisters of Mercy—the Presentation Nuns—previously Irish nuns, are exclusively devoted to the poor.

21552 But in their teaching is it not the religious rather than the secular element they are bound to keep in view?—Yes, but when they undertake a school they do both, and do them most effectively.

[Adjourned.]

## A.—TABLE referred to in Mr. WILLIAMSON'S Evidence, page 321, question 21015.

Dec 3, 1868.

Richard  
W. Williamson,  
Esq.

A GENERAL STATEMENT of moneys received on account of the Honorable the INDIAN SOCIETY, being the produce of their Estates, Fisheries, &c.; together with the Expenditure of the same, from the 5th day of February, 1837, to the 4th day of February, 1868.

## RECEIPTS.

	£	s	d.	Date of receipt (year).
Balance of last year's account, . . . . .	1,454	16	11	
Deery and Liberties, . . . . .	26,978	9	10	
Coleraine ditto, . . . . .	2,941	0	0	
Coleraine Port and Trade, &c., . . . . .	750	2	2	
	27,669	1	6	
Less statements to tenants, . . . . .	187	8	1	
	27,482	2	5	
For balance on account of rent, 1861, . . . . .	4,418	8	7	
Quit-rent from the Tinsmen's Company for three years to 25th March 1867, . . . . .	56	0	0	
Quit-rent from the Tinsmen's Company for three years to 25th March 1867, . . . . .	56	0	0	
Donated ground (see Journal), . . . . .	18	0	0	
Loans, . . . . .	614	17	4	
Interest on various low costs received, . . . . .	13	11	2	
Interest on various low costs received, &c., for 1867, . . . . .	2	1	9	
For balance bank sent out of the Lough Foyles, . . . . .	3,909	8	8	
For amount received on account of one year's rent of part of Lough Foyles, 1867, . . . . .	708	8	8	
	22,689	16	5	

## EXPENDITURE

## PERMANENT PAYMENTS, CROWN RENTS, &amp;c. :

Salary of Deery the Governor, and others of Deery, &c., . . . . .	247	10	10
Superintendant of Deery, annual allowance, . . . . .	80	20	0
Quit-rent to the Crown, . . . . .	182	9	10
Tolls, or emigration, Deery, 1867, . . . . .	145	0	0
Emigration for Deery, &c., Coleraine, 1867, . . . . .	49	0	0
Post rates, Deery, 1867, . . . . .	120	1	2
Post rates, Coleraine, 1867, . . . . .	61	1	8
Society's office in Deery, one year's rent, &c., . . . . .	44	8	8
Interest on various low costs received, 1867, . . . . .	13	11	2
County rates, . . . . .	65	1	1
Assessed taxes, . . . . .	42	0	0
	22,241	17	4

## DEBITATIONS TO SCHOOLS.—LONDONDERRY, CULMORE, and COLERAINE :

Date of receipt (year).	LONDONDERRY.—
1812	Lough Foyles college or Landreary free school, . . . . .
	Free master of Deery, . . . . .
	General master of Deery, . . . . .
1814	No 2 Education (to Deery College from Deery, John McRory, . . . . .
	No 1 Education (to Deery from Deery, Thomas Kapp, 11 year, . . . . .
	No 2 Education (to Deery from Deery, Vincent, . . . . .
	No 3 Education (to Deery from Deery, David Deery, . . . . .
	No 4 Education (to Deery from Deery, David Kapp, . . . . .
1816	Deery school, . . . . .
	Deery school, . . . . .
1818	St. Columba's National schools, . . . . .
1820	Pump-street female school, . . . . .
	Deery school, . . . . .
1822	Deery school, . . . . .
1824	Deery school, . . . . .
1826	Deery school, . . . . .
1828	Deery school, . . . . .
1830	Deery school, . . . . .
1832	Deery school, . . . . .
1834	Deery school, . . . . .
1836	Deery school, . . . . .
1838	Deery school, . . . . .
1840	Deery school, . . . . .
1842	Deery school, . . . . .
1844	Deery school, . . . . .
1846	Deery school, . . . . .
1848	Deery school, . . . . .
1850	Deery school, . . . . .
1852	Deery school, . . . . .
1854	Deery school, . . . . .
1856	Deery school, . . . . .
1858	Deery school, . . . . .
1860	Deery school, . . . . .
1862	Deery school, . . . . .
1864	Deery school, . . . . .
1866	Deery school, . . . . .
1868	Deery school, . . . . .

## Date of receipt (year).

1812	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1814	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1816	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1818	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1820	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1822	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1824	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1826	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1828	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1830	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1832	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1834	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1836	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1838	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1840	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1842	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1844	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1846	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1848	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1850	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1852	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1854	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1856	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1858	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1860	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1862	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1864	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1866	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .
1868	Waterside Reformed Presbyterian schools, . . . . .

## CULMORE.—

1812	Coleraine schools, . . . . . one year, . . . . .
	Coleraine —
1812	Schoolmaster of the Society's school for boys, . . . . .
1814	Schoolmaster of the Society's school for girls, . . . . .
	First assistant teacher Society's male school, . . . . .
	Second ditto ditto ditto, . . . . .
1816	Teacher of cutting-out work, school for girls, . . . . .
	Allowance for fuel at Society's schools, . . . . .
	Perquisites for boys, . . . . .
	Perquisites for girls, . . . . .
	Perquisites for boys, . . . . .
	Perquisites for girls, . . . . .
	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1818	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1820	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1822	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1824	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1826	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1828	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1830	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1832	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1834	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1836	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1838	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1840	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1842	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1844	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1846	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1848	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1850	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1852	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1854	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1856	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1858	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1860	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1862	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1864	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1866	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .
1868	Perquisites of Society's schools, . . . . .

## CHARITABLE DONATIONS.—LONDONDERRY and COLERAINE

1812	Indigent Room Ranges at Lough Foyles, . . . . .
	Indigent, . . . . .
1814	Indigent, . . . . .
1816	Indigent, . . . . .
1818	Indigent, . . . . .
1820	Indigent, . . . . .
1822	Indigent, . . . . .
1824	Indigent, . . . . .
1826	Indigent, . . . . .
1828	Indigent, . . . . .
1830	Indigent, . . . . .
1832	Indigent, . . . . .
1834	Indigent, . . . . .
1836	Indigent, . . . . .
1838	Indigent, . . . . .
1840	Indigent, . . . . .
1842	Indigent, . . . . .
1844	Indigent, . . . . .
1846	Indigent, . . . . .
1848	Indigent, . . . . .
1850	Indigent, . . . . .
1852	Indigent, . . . . .
1854	Indigent, . . . . .
1856	Indigent, . . . . .
1858	Indigent, . . . . .
1860	Indigent, . . . . .
1862	Indigent, . . . . .
1864	Indigent, . . . . .
1866	Indigent, . . . . .
1868	Indigent, . . . . .

Dec. 1, 1868.		LONDON:—continued—		GENERAL AND INCIDENTAL EXPENSES AND CHARGES—	
Day of original grant.				IRELAND :	
		£	s. d.		£ s. d.
Richard Williams, esq.	1858	Derry District Farming Society.	10	18	0
	1858	Irish Society's Tenant's Farming Society, for Promotions.	12	8	0
	"	John Pigg, Annuity.	20	8	0
	"	Robert Martin, ditto, half part.	2	18	0
	1859	Joseph Watson, ditto.	3	18	0
	1859	James N'Gowrie, ditto.	8	8	0
	1862	John Price, late Master of the Revenue Service School ditto.	8	0	0
	1858	Derry Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Society.	8	0	0
	"	Chenorey Agricultural Society of Ulster.	8	0	0
	1858	Yerks West of Ireland Agricultural Society, for Promotions.	20	0	0
	1858	Derry Young Men's Christian Association.	16	0	0
	"	Derry Young Men's Literary Association.	10	0	0
	1858	Derry Protestant Synod Asylum.	80	0	0
	"	Isaacson M'Chesed.	150	0	0
	"	Mrs Mary N'Chesed.	100	0	0
	1858	Londonderry Coal Fund.	10	10	0
	"	Mary Wright, ditto.	2	8	0
	"	E. Martin, ditto.	4	8	0
	"	Ann Jordan.	20	8	0
	"	Ann Reed.	3	18	0
	"	Georgetown Life Bond.	5	8	0
			<hr/>		
			4893	8	0
		<hr/>			
		CONTRIBUTIONS—			
	1858	Clothing for the Poor.	10	0	0
	1858	Coleraine District Farming Society.	8	0	0
	1858	Bills for Promotions.	20	0	0
	1858	Charles Grier.	5	0	0
	1858	Coleraine Church, for Orphan.	15	0	0
	"	Coleraine Workhouse Institute.	8	0	0
	1858	Coleraine Library, grant of books (Donation).	8	0	0
	"	Magdalen Canning (donation).	30	0	0
	1857	Coleraine Relief Fund (donation).	14	10	0
			<hr/>		
			2112	10	0
		<hr/>			
		GENERAL AND INCIDENTAL EXPENSES AND CHARGES—		ENGLAND :	
				Salary of the Clerk, 2157 18s., and Porter's Wages, 67s. 10s.	
				Taxes, Cash, Gas, Printing, Stationery, Advertising—	
				amount do.,	
				Law Expenses, do.,	
				Solicitor, do.,	
				The Governor, Deputy Governor, and Inspectors—	
				against themselves, for their attendance, do., 21	
				Twenty Meetings held during the year.	
				Lunch repaid, do.,	
				Interest, do.,	
				Balance in favour of the Society, do.,	
			<hr/>		
			2115	10	0
		<hr/>			
			2115	10	0

Examined and compared with the Accounts referred to in the within Account; and we find the Balance to be \$3,311 14c 3d. In Favor of the Society. As witness our hands, this 30th day of February, 1866.

WILLIAM ANDREWES ROSE, M.D., Governor  
FRANCIS WHEAT THURGOOD, Deputy-Governor  
JOHN CARTER, M.D.  
FREDERICK RENDALL GROVER  
GEORGE ROBERT DENISON,  
JAMES BROOKER, Deputy.

DAVID W. NATHANIEL, President  
JERRY STRONG  
THOMAS STRONG  
JOHN ANDERSON, COO  
SARAH STRAKER  
WILLIAM H. GORDON

Tanner Measure, *Sordiana*

THOMAS CYLINDER, GUTHRIE, ILL.  
February 4th, 1888.

The Very  
Not Lustrous  
Cotton Wool

B.—TIME TABLE referred to in Very Rev. LAURENCE CANON TOOLE'S Evidence, page 931, question 21273.

TIME TABLE.—ST. WILFRID'S BOYS' DAY SCHOOL.—1898

Class.	8 to 10.	11 to 12.	13 to 14.	15 to 16.	17 to 18.	19 to 20.	21 to 22.	23 to 24.	25 to 26.	27 to 28.		
1st.	Projects and Reading	Religious Instruction	Examination of Home Reports—Class Rules	Geometry	Writing or Book-keeping	Reading and Explanation	Reading and Explanation	Writing and Dictation	Spelling and Dictation, or Drawing	Spelling and Dictation, or Drawing		
2nd.				Geometry	Writing						Reading and Explanation	
3rd.				Tables and Arithmetic	Reading and Arithmetic						Writing and Dictation	Spelling and Dictation
4th.				Tables and Arithmetic	Reading, do.						Writing and Transcription	Spelling and Dictation
5th.				Tables and Arithmetic	Reading, do.						Writing	Spelling and Reading
6th.				Tables and Arithmetic	Spelling and Reading						Writing	Spelling and Reading

NOTE 2.—Dinner is served from three to four on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

TIME TABLE for St. WILFRED'S GIRLS' SCHOOL.

Dec. 3, 1868.

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Casson, D.D.

Class.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
1 Standard V. and VI.	Preparatory and Tutorial	Reading	Copied	Dictation	Arithmetic	Religious Instruction	Reading	Arithmetic	Dictation	Singing and Rhythmic	Vocal	
2 Standard IV.		Dictation	Reading	Arithmetic	Copied		Arithmetic	Reading	Dictation			
3 Standard III.		Reading	Dictation	Arithmetic	Arithmetic or Copied		Reading	Reading or Arithmetic	Dictation			
4 Standard II.		Copied	Reading	Dictation	Arithmetic		Arithmetic	Dictation	Reading			
5 Standard I.		Arithmetic and Tables	Writing	Reading	Reading		Writing	Arithmetic	Reading			
6 Standard I.		Reading	Arithmetic	Writing	Reading		Reading	Reading	Arithmetic or Writing			

Notes 1.—(Special) Religious Instruction given by one of the Priests, every Monday from 2 to 4.

Notes 2.—Evening Lessons from 2 to 3 on Tuesday and Thursday.

Notes 3.—Class Rules marked: 100 &amp; 11, 110 &amp; 12.

Average attendance for past year, 140

No. present for examination, 120

No. present at all during year, 240

TIME TABLE.—St. WILFRED'S INFANTS' SCHOOL.

Class.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.	21.	22.
1st.	Preparatory and Tutorial	Reading	Transcription	Reading	Arithmetic	Singing and Rhythmic	Religious Instruction, or Sacred History	Preparatory and Tutorial	Religious Instruction	Reading	Writing	Singing and Rhythmic	Tables	Singing and Rhythmic
2nd.		Writing	Reading	Arithmetic						Writing	Reading			
3rd.		Reading	Arithmetic	Reading						Reading	Writing			
4th.		Arithmetic	Reading	Writing						Writing	Reading			
5th.	Infants or Nursery	Reading	Object Lessons	Play-ground	Counting	Instructions, or Sacred History	Preparatory and Tutorial	Religious Instruction	Preparatory and Tutorial	Alphabet	Writing	Play-ground	Counting	Singing and Rhythmic
6th.		Reading	Object Lessons	Play-ground						Alphabet	Writing			

Average attendance for past year, 140

Number present for examination, 120

Number present at all during year, 240

Class Rules marked on 100 &amp; 11, 110 &amp; 12

FIFTY-FIFTH DAY.—DUBLIN, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1868.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. the Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

The Right Hon. the Earl of DUNMAYNE, K. B.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord Bishop of MEATH.

The Right Hon. Lord CLONMANN.

The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MORRIS.

Sir ROBERT KANE, F. R. S.

WILLIAM BRONKH, Esq., M.C.

REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

JAMES ANTHONY DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq.

SCOTT NANCYTH STOKES, Esq.

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.D.

LAURENCE WALTON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., }  
D. B. DUNKE, Esq., } Secretaries.

The Very Rev. JAMES BYRNE, A.M., Dean of Clonsilla, sworn and examined.

Dec. 4, 1868.

21553 The Chairman.—Where do you reside, Mr. Dean?—In the county of Tyrone, near Omagh.

21554 Have you any care of souls connected with your diocese?—Not connected with my diocese, but I have a care of souls as rector of a parish.

21555 What parish?—The parish of Cappagh.

21556 In the county of Tyrone?—In the county of Tyrone.

21557 What are the circumstances of that parish as to mixture of denominations?—About one-half of

the population is Roman Catholic, and the other half equally divided between Presbyterians and Episcopalians.

21558 Are you manager of any schools in the parish?—Yes; I am sole manager of three schools, and joint manager of a fourth.

21559 With whom are you joint manager of the fourth?—With Major Ellis.

21560 Is he of the Established Church?—Yes.

21561 What number of Roman Catholics attend

G E 2

The Very  
Rev. James  
Byrne, A.M.  
Dean of  
Clonsilla

Dec. 4, 1885.

The Very  
Rev. James  
Byrne, a. m.,  
Dean of  
Cork.

your schools?—About a fourth, I think; about ten or a dozen in each.

21562. Are there other Roman Catholic schools in the parish under Roman Catholic management?—Yes, several.

21563. Are they contiguous to yours?—The nearest is about two miles from mine.

21564. Do the Roman Catholics who attend your schools attend because they are more conveniently situated to them than the schools under Roman Catholic management, or from any preference for the master, or the instruction in your school?—I think both causes operate.

21565. Do many of your parishioners, or of the Protestants attend the Roman Catholic schools?—A few. There is one Roman Catholic school at which I learned the other day there were twenty Episcopalian children in attendance.

21566. Was that from the convenience of situation or from any personal reasons?—Well, it is a strange thing, and at first I could not understand it, because the model school is equally convenient to them, and the only explanation I can give of it is, that they think that at the model school they should be better dressed. I thought that the model school would supply the want of all my own people that were within reach of it, but that difficulty certainly does operate in keeping children from it, and, in consequence, I suppose, those children attend the Roman Catholic school preferably, for they do not attend the model school.

21567. Were you ever connected with the Church Education Society?—When I first went to the parish there were some Church Education schools under my patronage, but, from the first, before I took orders, I had accepted in my own mind the principle of the National Board.

21568. Have you found any difficulty in your schools in carrying out the regulations of the National Board with respect to religious education?—None whatever.

21569. Are you satisfied with the result of the teaching of those National schools upon the children educated in them?—Well, I am not at all satisfied, but I believe that the imperfection of the result arises from the bad attendance of the children rather than from any defect in the system.

21570. Do you think it would be desirable that in order to promote the attendance of the children, a portion of the money paid by the State to the schools should be according to results?—I should be afraid of that, because I think it would operate unequally on the different religious bodies, for in general the Protestant schools are small in numbers, and there would be a large amount earned in that way by the Roman Catholic schools, and I think it might be a source of jealousy and dissension in the country.

21571. Setting aside that reason, do you think it would have a useful effect in stimulating masters?—I do not think it would add in any important way to the stimulus that they already have, because if their school falls below a certain average, their salary is reduced; and also, there is this practical point connected with it, that when their school is considerably above the number required, they can then insist on school fees, so that it is a very great point with teachers of schools to have their schools well attended.

21572. What proportion of the children of the schools under your management pay school fees?—The amount is very small. I think in my own schools—in the two that are immediately in my own district of the parish, there is not more than a couple of pounds a year, as well as, as I remember, paid to each.

21573. Do any of the landowners in your parish give subscriptions to any of the schools?—Yes, to the school of which I am joint patron there is a large subscription given from the MacMahon property.

21574. Have any of the schoolmasters in your parish free residences given them?—Only one, I think—only one out of those four schools. But in the Mountfield school, of which I am joint patron, there is a residence

if the master chooses to occupy it; but he has preferred to take another house in which his father and mother are with him. There are really then two schools with free residences.

21575. Do you think it would be an advantage to the schools and to the masters if residences were more generally provided for them?—Oh, I think that everything that will increase their gains is a most important advantage.

21576. Is there a model school in your parish?—Yes.

21577. Do you pay much attention to it?—Yes, I take an interest in it. However, I have such great confidence in the system of carrying out secular education as I have stated, that I don't feel it very important on me to look after it; but the religious instruction is attended to by me and my curate.

21578. Do you consider the education given in the model school efficient?—Of course there is the same difficulty in it as in the other schools—the bad attendance of the children; but I believe, so far as the system itself is concerned, it is as good as can be desired.

21579. Do you consider the system of inspection good?—I do.

21580. Do the monitor or teachers who are trained in your model school turn out efficient masters afterwards?—I have heard no complaint of them. I have had no experience myself, indeed, nor can I say much from personal knowledge.

21581. Have you had any experience either of the agricultural schools or of the small school gardens?—No; I have no personal experience of them.

21582. Are there any points in which you desire any material change in the National system?—The only point that strikes me is the very obvious one that the children of parents of the upper classes, attending model schools, ought to pay for their instruction as much as they should pay in a school of private enterprise. I think that that would operate in two beneficial ways. It would prevent what I consider a misuse of the State funds in educating those who are able to pay for their own education; but it would also have the other effect, that it would prevent the model schools from supplanting and excluding as they do at present schools of private enterprise.

21583. Is not that an administrative reform which might be made at any moment by the Board?—Yes, I think so.

21584. Do you think the opinion expressed now is one generally entertained by the gentry and clergy in the country—the opinion that the richer people, who send their children to the model schools, should pay higher fees?—I think it is, except by those who are interested—who are inclined to take advantage themselves of the present system.

21585. Do you think that the working of the National system has tended at all to promote cordiality between people of opposite religious opinions?—I could not say. One should be able to contrast the present state of things with what it would be under any other system, in order to form an opinion on that. I believe that, judged in that way, it has a most important effect.

21586. Sir Robert Ross.—Then am I to understand your answer as indicating that you have formed an opinion that the National system of education tends to promote social and friendly feelings amongst the class of people who resort to those schools?—I meant that if what is generally called the denominational system were substituted for it it would have a demoralising effect, and that we should soon see the benefit that we at present derive from the National Board—in the way of preventing dissension, at least.

21587. You mentioned that in those schools of which you are manager there is a certain number of Roman Catholics present?—Yes.

21588. Are there Roman Catholics in each of the four schools?—Yes, in each one of the four schools.

21589. And does that intermixture of religion, so you experience, lead in any way to intolerance or collision amongst the children or their families?—No, not in the least.

21590. Have you any reason to suppose that it leads to any improper subordination of religious feeling or indifference in regard to religious matters?—I have never observed any such effect.

21591. How is the religious instruction given to the Roman Catholic children in those schools?—All those schools are non-vested schools, so that there is no religious instruction given to the Roman Catholics.

21592. You are the sole patron of those of those?—I am sole patron of three.

21593. Is there any Roman Catholic master in either of those schools?—No.

21594. Are any of those schools large enough to allow of an assistant master?—Yes; there is an assistant in the Mountfield school.

21595. Is that assistant also a Protestant?—Yes.

21596. Would you, as patron, object to any Roman Catholic person, clergyman or other, going into those schools and attending those schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction to the Catholic minority that attends it?—Well, I really do not think I would.

The question was never put to me. There was at one time a proposal made to have a Roman Catholic second master in the school of which I am joint patron, and Major Ellis had a strong feeling against it, and very much in consequence of that feeling of his we declined it. At the time that that request was made he and I certainly agreed; he understood that it was my wish, as well as I understood that it was his wish, that the second teacher should be a Protestant; but still it is a point on which, in my own mind, I have always wavered very much; and I would not, myself, I think, have any objection to it. There is one thing that a clergyman must always consider, particularly in the North of Ireland, that is, the effect which any act of his would produce on his own people, and I might be deterred from acceding to the request for fear of offending my own people.

21597. What proportion of Roman Catholics were in that school of which you spoke?—I could not speak positively, but I should say perhaps about a third.

21598. About one-third of the whole school?—Yes.

21599. Was any proposition ever made to you by any Roman Catholic clergyman or other to allow religious instruction to be given?—There was a request made to me by the Roman Catholic parents of children attending one of my schools to instruct my own teacher to teach the Roman Catholic children, and that request I refused, because I did not like to ask him who was a conscientious Protestant to teach religious doctrine which he did not believe; but there never was any request made to me by either a Roman Catholic clergyman or any Roman Catholic to give religious instruction to the Roman Catholics.

21600. How far is that school from any school under Roman Catholic management?—About an Irish mile and a half, I think.

21601. Then, do you think that it was the greater convenience of attending that school that induced those Roman Catholic children to frequent it?—No; I think that in that particular case what brought them to the school was rather the superiority.

21602. Do you think then, that Major Ellis, whose feelings you have just stated to be strongly Protestant, coerced upon the parents of those children any direct influence to induce them to send their children to that school?—No, I am sure he did not.

21603. Was he their landlord, generally?—He is the agent of the property—amongst the property.

21604. Do you think that the fact of being the agent did not operate materially in bringing those children to the school?—I could not say. I am sure that he himself did nothing; and I am sure also, that their attendance is sufficiently explained by the great excellence of the school. It is the best school in the parish, except the model school.

21605. In the Roman Catholic schools, the schools under Roman Catholic management, you mentioned that there was a certain number of Protestants in attendance?—Protestant children?—Yes; at some of them.

21606. And in one of the schools so many as twenty?—As twenty on the rolls.

21607. Now, is there any provision that you are aware of, for the religious instruction of those Protestant minorities?—Yes; it is a vested school, and my curate attends regularly to give them religious instruction.

21608. Under whose management is it—who is the patron of that school?—The patron is the Roman Catholic priest, the parish priest.

21609. But your curate attends?—My curate attends to give religious instruction to the Church children.

21610. With the approval of the priest?—With his full approval; of course that could not be withheld, but with the most friendly willingness to make every regulation to suit his convenience.

21611. Does that instruction take place in the school?—Yes; I think in the school itself, there is no other apartment.

21612. And is it your opinion, that that co-operation and mutual tolerance of the Roman Catholic clergyman and of your curate will act as an example to the families of the children who are connected with that school?—I believe a most salutary example.

21613. Is not that one of the advantages which may be expected to result from the general diffusion of the National system of united education throughout Ireland?—Yes; I think so.

21614. In your general experience of the country do you think that that is a result which is gradually taking place?—I really cannot say. It is so very difficult to trace social effects from fine causes of that kind, that I cannot say that I have observed it as a fact. I have always thought, indeed, that in the neighbourhood of Omagh there was a great spirit of liberal feeling—I do not mean politically, but a feeling of liberality towards those who differ—and I certainly have always thought that that arose in a considerable degree from the influence of the clergy around; for it so happens that almost all the clergy of the Church in the neighbourhood of Omagh are supporters of the National Board. I think I might say that in the neighbourhood of Omagh I have observed a salutary effect of that kind.

21615. Are there any Roman Catholic children attending the model school in Omagh?—There are twelve, I think.

21616. Amongst the masters in the model school in Omagh are there some Roman Catholics?—Yes; the third master is a Roman Catholic and the head mistress is a Roman Catholic, and I think the assistant in the infant school also.

21617. Do you know whether religious instruction is given by this master and mistress to the Roman Catholic children who are in attendance?—I do not think there is any religious instruction given to the Roman Catholic children.

21618. You yourself and your curate supply religious instruction to the Protestant children of the Established Church?—Yes, to the children of the Established Church; and the Presbyterian and Methodist ministers attend to the children of their communities.

21619. You mentioned that in your opinion those persons of the middle classes who sent their children for instruction in the model schools, should pay at a higher rate, something like what they should pay in private schools for that instruction?—Yes.

21620. Do you think, however, subject to that payment, that the presence of those children and the admixture of a certain number of middle class children with the children of the poorer classes is a disadvantage in those schools?—No, a very great advantage. I think it acts beneficially both on the masters and on the children. It raises the social status of the teachers having the instruction of those children; and it exerts a civilizing influence on the children of the poorer classes.

21621. Then, subject to the payment of properly arranged fees, do you think on the whole that the model schools should be open to the children of the middle classes to attend if they think fit?—Certainly.

Dec 4, 1866.

The Very Rev. James Bryce, A.M., Dean of Clonfert.

Dec. 4, 1892.

The Very  
Rev. James  
Byrne, A.M.,  
Dean of  
Clogher.

21622. You mentioned that when you first went to your parish in Tyrone there were some Church Education schools in the parish?—Yes.

21623. What became of those—are they still in operation?—No, they had a miserable struggling existence for a long time—one of them at least for a long time—but it died out completely when the model school was established.

21624. They do not now exist?—They do not now exist.

21625. The other school?—The other Church Education school was the Mountfield school, it was a Church Education school when I came to the parish, but owing very much to discussion of the question, Major Ellis, who is the manager of the estate, accepted the principle of the National Board, and then the school was put in connexion.

21626. And you believe that on the whole the clergy of the Established Church in the district to which your parish belongs are favourable to, or at least willing to acquiesce in the maintenance of the National system of education?—Well, at the present time the rector of Omagh is strongly opposed to the National system of education, but he has only lately come, and his predecessor took a kind of middle course. He had schools of his own under the National Board, and yet he did not seem quite to approve of it. The rectors of the three parishes around the parish of Omagh are all supporters of the National Board, and in that way an influence has certainly been exerted by them.

21627. Is it not natural for the clergy of any Church to look at the subject of education from a somewhat professional point of view?—Yes, I think so.

21628. And in that way they come to demand a system of denominational education?—Yes, I think it is so natural as to be almost inevitable.

21629. In such a system of denominational education, demanded by and in the interests of the clergy as a profession, would there not be a danger of the secular education, which should be given to the child as a citizen of the State, being unduly subordinated to the maintenance of mere religious dogmas?—Well, secular education could not be too much subordinated to the communication of religious truth, unless in attempting to infuse religious dogmas into it some evil efforts were produced. I believe that, in the case of Ireland, a denominational system of education would have the effect of so infusing religious ideas and religious dogmas into secular education as that that secular education would have a most disarming effect on the nation.

21630. And therefore a system which whilst giving due importance to religious instruction and maintaining its position in a perfectly unobjectionable manner might still secure secular instruction from interference, and provide that every department of secular instruction should be fully and independently taught in the school, such a system would be preferable to a purely denominational system, under which the practical government of the schools would be placed in the hands of the clergy?—I believe that the present system is very preferable indeed to a denominational system, in consequence of the evils that I speak of.

21631. Master Brooke.—May I ask you what is the amount of religious instruction that your Protestant children receive in your schools?—The Authorized Version of the Scriptures read daily, and weekly instruction in the Church Catechism.

21632. That is on the Saturday, I suppose?—No; not on Saturday, because Saturday being the market day there is a very small attendance, but on different days in different schools.

21633. And who communicates that instruction?—The ordinary routine of it is done by the teachers of the schools, but they are visited by me and my curate, and when we visit we give instruction.

21634. That of course is carried on at a separate hour?—Yes; at a separate hour.

21635. Is it before or after or in the middle of the secular instruction?—After.

21636. At the end of the day?—At the end of the day.

21637. How long is the school open for secular instruction?—From ten to half past two.

21638. And then the Roman Catholics are dismissed?—Then the Roman Catholics return.

21639. And then comes the half-hour for reading the Scriptures?—Yes.

21640. You have already told me that Roman Catholic children receive no religious instruction?—They receive none in connexion with the school.

21641. Now in these Roman Catholic schools where some of your Protestant children attend, their religious instruction you told me is provided by one of your curates?—Yes.

21642. How often does he go?—He goes I think weekly.

21643. That is once a week?—Once a week I think. He is a very steady man in performing his duty, and I think I may say that unless something occurs to prevent him, he goes once a week.

21644. That is the first instance I think I may tell you, as far as my experience goes, that has occurred in the investigation on this Commission, of a Roman Catholic clergyman admitting a Protestant clergyman; and therefore I want to ask in there any peculiar reason why that was done?—Oh, not the least.

21645. Had you any conversation with the Roman Catholic clergyman on the subject before the visit was made?—I had not; but my parish is divided into three districts, and this school is not in the district under my immediate charge, so that the curate has sole charge of it, and he it was that spoke to the Roman Catholic priest in making the arrangement.

21646. Have you a Protestant school in that district?—Yes; in that district, but at some distance—at a considerable distance. I should mention that the model school which is in that district is quite sufficiently near to those Church children to attend it.

21647. There is no school under your own or your curate's peculiar management?—Not in that part of the district.

21648. I asked you, in order to lead to the question, whether there was any mutual contract between the Roman Catholic clergyman and your curate, as to mutually visiting the schools?—There was nothing of that sort—not in the least; for I have no vested school under my patronage. This is a vested school.

21649. This was a vested school?—Yes.

21650. In that particular case it was a vested school where your curate had a right to go in?—Yes, as a right.

21651. Do you know any instance of a non-vested school where a clergyman of a different denomination visited?—No, I do not. I know a very singular instance of a non-vested school under the patronage of a Church clergyman in which the master is a Roman Catholic. The only master of the school is a Roman Catholic; and he reads the Authorized Version of the Scriptures with the few children belonging to the Church that attend it. If you wish I shall mention the circumstances of that school.

21652. If you please?—It is a part of the parish inhabited almost altogether by Roman Catholics.

21653. Of your parish?—No; in another parish under a friend of mine.

21654. Mr. Doss.—Will you mention the name of the parish?—I would rather not.

21655. Master Brooke.—You mentioned Major Ellis as the agent of the property; who is the landlord?—Sir Benard MacMahon.

21656. Now, at ten o'clock your schools begin I believe?—Yes.

21657. And continue until half past two with secular instruction, during that period there is a total silence on the subject of religious instruction; there is no sort of religious instruction given, I presume, during that period?—None; as religious instruction is defined by the rules of the Board.

21658. Then there is some religious instruction not covered by the rules of the Board?—Certainly; there



is religious instruction in the reading books of the Board; there is religion very frequently in the admonitions of the teacher.

21659. That you think is competent?—Certainly; in the reproof of any fault; in the drawing attention to the lesson that is always hung on the wall.

21660. Would you consider it competent for the teacher during that time to refer to the Scriptures, and state that he was quoting from the Scriptures, as a ground for his reproof?—I should consider it within the spirit of the rules of the Board, that the teacher should refer to the Scriptures without actually reading them—that he should refer to them on moral questions.

21661. You object to what is called the denominational system. I presume you would call the system of the Church Education Society a denominational system?—Yes; I should call any system a denominational system in which there was no conscience clause, as it is called.

21662. You say that the teaching in such a school must have a demoralising effect. Will you explain that further?—Well, I think what I stated was, that the secular instruction in the form which it would probably assume, must have a demoralising effect; that provided it assumed the form which I think probable, it would certainly have a demoralising effect; and my meaning was this.—I believe that, in the present state of religious feeling in Ireland, if there were a denominational system established, there would be separate reading books employed by the different denominations, and I believe that these reading books would be impregnated with religious dogmas; and, with the distinct ideas that spring from religious dogmas, that the various denominations would start early in life with radically different views of things and of social relations.

21663. But would it be wise for the sake of union, as the hope for result, to leave out the incubation of those dogmata which distinguish the separate creeds?—I think that the present reading books are very highly preferable to what I believe would arise under such a system; and from them religion is not absolutely excluded.

21664. May I ask you, as you had two Church Education schools in your parish, do you not know something of the books used there?—Yes.

21665. Did they in any respect materially differ from the sort of education that you give in the half-hour a day, or in the weekly lesson that you give your children?—I am speaking now of the secular instruction—the secular reading books.

21666. But do those secular books give different instruction on religious matters from that which is contemplated by yourself?—I believe not, and my observation refers rather to the working of a denominational system under the Roman Catholic Church, because I believe that the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church are led by the very principles of their church to insist more on dogma, and to mix up dogma more with the ideas of social duty than any Protestant Church. My observation referred rather to the effect of denominationalism on the reading books in Roman Catholic schools.

21667. Then you object to denominational schools mainly from the apprehension of the teaching of the Roman Catholic denominational schools?—In reference to its action on the school instruction, I do mainly refer to the Roman Catholic schools, but that is not my only objection to denominational education. I think there is an equally strong objection arising from the oppression of religious minorities under a denominational system.

21668. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—May I ask what meaning you attach to the last statement you have made—the oppression of religious minorities under the denominational system?—I mean that in localities where the members of a religious body are so few that they cannot have a school under a patron of their own denomination, they would be forced to receive religious instruction to which they object—forced on pain of being uneducated altogether.

21669. Has your attention been turned to another scheme (denominational) of this sort, that in each parish, say, in the South and West of Ireland, there should be a school under a Roman Catholic manager, and a Roman Catholic teacher, and with Roman Catholic children, and another school with a Protestant manager, Protestant teacher, and Protestant children—what do you say in regard to such a denominational scheme as that?—I should object to that for two reasons, in the first place I think it would not be unequal. The plan, as I apprehend it, is that wherever there are schools belonging to the different religious bodies, then there need not be a conscience clause. The application of that rule would not be unequal in this way. Wherever there is a Church school there will also be a Roman Catholic school, in consequence of the universal presence of the Roman Catholic population; so that the Church schools would all of them have a privilege which the clergy regard as a privilege, of dispensing with a conscience clause; but it is not the fact that wherever a Roman Catholic school exists, there is also a Protestant school; so that the Roman Catholic clergy would not all of them have the same privilege which they prize so highly—if I make myself understood, that is one objection that I have to it; and another objection is, that it would take effect, notwithstanding what I have just stated, in so large a number of instances, that it would break up the education of the country altogether into the denominational system. You would have different inspectors for these denominational schools, and the members of the joint Board would, according to their own persuasion, find themselves interested, some in one class of these schools, and some in another, and the tendency would be to break up the Board into two different Boards, and ultimately to generate a thoroughly denominational system. That is my second objection.

21670. Are you acquainted with the South and West of Ireland to any extent?—I am a native of the southern part of Leitrim.

21671. From your acquaintance with that portion of the country do you concur in the testimony of the late Archbishop of Dublin when he stated that in many parishes the Protestant minorities were so small that an efficient school could not be maintained for them?—Yes, I believe so.

21672. In connection with that you have referred to the Church Education schools in your neighbourhood as maintaining for some time a struggling existence; do you regard that as necessarily connected with small schools, that their existence must be a struggling one?—It did not arise to much from the smallness of the numbers in attendance so from the deficient pay of the masters, owing to the poverty of the Society.

21673. Do you think that where the minorities are small, and a school maintained for them, there must be more or less of a deteriorating influence both upon the master and on the school itself?—Certainly.

21674. Should you think it desirable, for the sake of secular education itself, that a system should be established necessitating the multiplication of small schools, and necessarily inefficient schools in the country?—No; I think the multiplication of schools beyond what is absolutely necessary has a most deteriorating influence.

21675. In answer to Master Brooke, you have stated that the denominational system would have a demoralising effect; did you refer to the effect in this way, that representatives of the different denominations must necessarily have rival schools in each district?—No; but I referred rather to the different tone that would pervade the reading books.

21676. But would not such systems necessarily create rival schools in each district?—Well, I would not apprehend much evil from that.

21677. I think you stated that personally you should have no objection to a Roman Catholic teacher in a school as an assistant, but that you felt at your duty to consider the effect produced upon your people in regard to such an appointment?—Precisely.

21678. I presume that you would think it fair that

Dec. 4, 1868.  
The Very  
Rev. James  
Horne, A.M.,  
Dean of  
Cork.

Dec. 4, 1869

The Very  
Rev. James  
Byrne, A.M.,  
Dean of  
Gloucester

Roman Catholic managers should keep the same point in view in the appointment of teachers in schools under their management?—Certainly.

21679. In the case of such schools where the Protestant minorities would be small, and the teachers Roman Catholics, should you be satisfied with the protective rules of the Board, that Established Church children should attend such schools for their secular instruction?—I would much rather have a school for them in which religious instruction would be provided for them. But, in the difficulties of the case, I would accept that as the best solution.

21680. You say in reference to a certain school that you think its superiority induced the attendance of Roman Catholic children?—Yes.

21681. In what did the superiority consist?—In the excellence of the secular instruction, the master being a first-class, and in all respects a remarkably efficient teacher.

21682. Should you think it proper that any child should, on the ground of religious denominations, be prevented from enjoying the best educational advantages to be had in schools supported by the funds of the State?—Certainly not.

21683. Are the Roman Catholic population in your neighbourhood generally satisfied with the existing system as a united system of education?—As far as I have the means of knowing, they are.

21684. May I ask in your schools have you had much experience in imparting religious instruction to your children?—Yes, I have.

21685. And adopting the best mode of making it effective, I presume?—Well, it was my duty, and I hope in some degree I did it.

21686. Now, is it your opinion that religious instruction, to be efficient, should be distinct from the secular, and given at a separate time?—I cannot imagine how it would be given if not distinct from the secular.

21687. Should you regard it as at all an advisable or right thing that religious and secular instruction should be interwoven and left to be given by teachers, whether judicious or injudicious, well qualified or otherwise?—Certainly not. It would be impossible to give it with sufficient distinctness in that way.

21688. Lord Clifden?—Has it ever occurred to you whether it would be possible for the State to acknowledge only secular education, and to inspect and to pay for only secular education, leaving the religious element out altogether, to be dealt with according to the patron of the schools?—That is the present system of the National Board, and I think it is the best solution of the question. If I understand the question under the present system of the National Board, the inspection refers altogether to the secular instruction, and to it alone, and to the patron is allowed the privilege of having what religious instruction he pleases, or none if he pleases.

21689. Yes, but that is not my question. I want to know, supposing in the schools the religious element was left to be dealt with according to the wish of the patron, and that the State paid no attention to that, but merely required a good secular education, and paid in proportion to that education, you think that such a system as that would answer?—I think that it is highly important that the teacher of the school should give religious instruction, because otherwise I am afraid it would not be given with sufficient regularity, and therefore I think it is highly important that the patron should not only have the absolute power of determining what religious instruction should be given, but that also, in order to secure its being given he should have the appointment of the teacher, and the power to dismiss the teacher. That secures that the religious instruction which the patron wishes to be given shall be given, and I think it is highly important in any system that may be constructed, that some such security should be retained for the religious instruction being given daily.

21690. Yes, but in the case I am supposing the patron would naturally see that his teacher should

give religious instruction, and, in fact, would take care that it was done; but do you think that the State could support a school without interfering in any kind of way, leaving the patron give whatever religious instruction he may, and to every one he pleases, and the State merely concerning itself with the secular education?—No; I think the State is bound to protect minorities, which it can do only by interfering thus far with religious instruction, namely, insisting on a conscience clause.

21691. I think you said one of the greatest evils of denominational education—one of the evils at least—would be that the Board would have separate inspectors, separate inspectors being necessary; do you think that that is absolutely necessary—that supposing there were denominational schools, so far as the State were concerned the inspection of these schools might be conducted equally—that one Inspector might inspect the school of another denomination?—I believe that the practical working of it in Ireland would be that the Roman Catholic schools would be inspected by Roman Catholic Inspectors. I believe that any other plan would cause very great dissatisfaction, and would be an offence which could not be justified.

21692. And why should it give dissatisfaction if the State would merely inquire that the children were satisfactorily educated, and would not go into the religious element at all?—I believe that the Roman Catholic hierarchy are conscientiously impressed with the duty of having secular instruction thoroughly penetrated with religious ideas, and that that being the case they would require Roman Catholic Inspectors.

21693. Well, that being the case do you think it practicable, where there is such a large majority of Roman Catholics, if such is the feeling of the Roman Catholic clergy, to maintain an education of the sort you advocate against the conscience, and against the whole influence of that hierarchy?—Yes; it is forced to be practicable.

21694. You say that the Roman Catholics in your neighbourhood are perfectly satisfied with this system.—As far as I have the means of judging they are perfectly satisfied.

21695. Have you reason to believe that they would prefer the system that exists now to a denominational system?—I do not know that if you put the question to them they would know what answer to give exactly. I do not know that they have any opinion on the subject—at least so far as my knowledge reaches, which is not very extensive.

21696. Then the fact is that your view is that the present system works advantageously for the country, and that you do not wish to see any alteration?—Certainly.

21697. Mr. Dease.—Are there many Roman Catholics attending your schools?—There are about one-fourth in three of them, and about one-third in the fourth—of the whole number.

21698. Are there any other National schools within what you would call reasonable reach of the Roman Catholic children attending these schools?—Yes.

21699. Then there would be no practical difficulty in the way of these Roman Catholic children going to the other schools, supposing that they thought them preferable to yours?—In one case there would be no practical difficulty whatever. In another case the Roman Catholic school is at an inconvenient distance. I have altogether four schools, and I may say that in the case of two of the four there are Roman Catholic schools sufficiently near, and at a convenient distance, and in the case of the other two inconveniently remote.

21700. Your schools, I think, you stated, were, with the exception of one, non-vested schools?—They are all non-vested.

21701. I think you have already stated, in answer to another Commissioner, that you have never known an instance of a Roman Catholic clergyman giving religious instruction in a non-vested school of which the patron was a Protestant?—No, I have never known it.

21702. Have you never known an instance of an application being made for permission to do so?—No; I have never known it.

21703. Have you ever known an instance of an Established Church teacher teaching young Roman Catholic children the Roman Catholic Catechism—the converse of the case which you stated?—Yes; I think I have. My impression is that there are many such cases. I cannot exactly call to mind whether any such case came under my own immediate knowledge.

21704. Supposing that in one of your own schools it were desired by the parents of the Roman Catholic children in attendance, your teacher being a member of the Established Church, that he should teach them the Roman Catholic Catechism, should you have any objection to his doing so?—Yes. The case did occur, and I asked my teacher what he thought of it, and he said that, being a conscientious Protestant, he certainly had an objection to teaching a doctrine which he did not believe; and we agreed between us that I should refuse the Roman Catholic parents what they requested.

21705. You stated that, in your opinion, it is desirable that teachers of schools should give religious instruction, inasmuch as there would be a difficulty about the pupils receiving a sufficient amount of it unless it were given by the teachers of the schools?—Yes.

21706. Would there not then be, in your opinion, fewer pupils throughout Ireland left without religious instruction given by the school teachers under a denominational than under a mixed system—for this reason, that under a mixed system, so many pupils not of the religious denomination of the teacher, are necessarily excluded?—Yes; I think so. I think there would be fewer children left without weekly religious instruction. There is a less amount of religious instruction under the present system than there would be under the denominational system. I mean when I say a less amount that I agree with you that there would be, under the denominational system, fewer children left uneducated in religious teaching in connection with the school.

21707. In reference to another answer that you gave to one of the Commissioners, may I ask you whether we are to understand that your preference for the mixed system arises from the fact that it gives to you, as the Protestants, all that you desire, while it deprives Roman Catholics of what they wish for?—No, but because it is the best for the country.

21708. A statement has been made by another witness, a high legal authority, and a member of the Church Education Society, to this Commission, that there is no district of Ireland in which the members of the Established Church are the majority, where they have not a Protestant school accessible. Does your opinion coincide with that expressed by that gentleman?—No. I certainly have not such exact information on the subject as to be able to speak confidently, but my opinion does not coincide with that.

21709. Mr. Stokes—You have expressed a strong feeling, I think, that religious toleration deserves the protection of the State?—Yes.

21710. Is it your opinion that that protection should be carried so far as to prejudice the interests of the majority?—No.

21711. Do you think that religious minorities in England and Scotland are entitled to equal consideration with the religious minorities in Ireland?—Certainly, where they exist.

21712. Is it your opinion that Protestants, whether in the majority or minority, are entitled to more consideration than Roman Catholics?—Certainly not.

21713. Are you unrepresented with the general population of the town of Omagh?—Yes; I think it is something about 4,000.

21714. Is not the majority of them Roman Catholic?—I think so.

21715. Are not the Roman Catholics poor, generally speaking?—Not in Omagh.

21716. Do they not form the poorest portion of the population?—Well, I suppose they do, even there.

21717. Who is the landlord of the property over which Major Ellis is agent?—Sir Beresford Mac Mahon.

21718. Is there any difficulty on that property in obtaining sites for schools under Roman Catholic management?—I am not aware of any.

21719. You have never heard of any?—I have never heard of any.

21720. You have expressed surprise that many of your children do not attend the model schools?—Yes.

21721. Does the remark apply to both sexes, boys equally with girls, or to one sex more than to the other?—Not to one sex more than the other; I think not.

21722. Are you satisfied with the management of the model school?—I am, with the one exception that I mentioned, the children of the comfortable classes who ought to be obliged to pay, as I said before.

21723. Are you satisfied that the management of the model school in your locality should be conducted here in Dublin?—I see no bad effect arising from that.

21724. Have you ever heard that there existed among the population an objection to the teachers, or to any of them?—Of the model school?

21725. Yes?—I never heard.

21726. Would you yourself say that married women separated from their husbands under circumstances reflecting disgrace upon either party, would be proper persons to be entrusted on the responsibility of the State as models to the girls and young women of the district?—No; certainly not, if it reflected any disgrace on her. But, in the case to which you allude, I do not know that there is the slightest slur on her character; and, in justice to her, I must ask leave to say that the cause of the separation, so far as I have understood it, was the fault of her husband.

21727. Are there not more such cases than one to be found in the model school at Omagh?—Yes; but without any disgrace whatsoever, that I ever heard of, on the character of the teachers.

21728. Do you consider it desirable that young persons in school should be tempted to gossip about those set over them as the victims of views which prudent parents generally conceal with the strictest care from the knowledge of their children?—I think it most undesirable, but I do not see any connection between the question and anything in the Omagh model school.

21729. The Chairman—Is it common for clergy of the minority to give instruction in school-houses under adverse management?—Well I know, in my own experience, of only one or two cases.

21730. One being your own curate?—One being my own curate.

21731. Is it not the general custom of the country for a minister of one denomination to go into a school belonging to another?—The general custom? I think so, owing to the way in which the clergy of the Church have, in so large a proportion, held aloof from the National system of education altogether. At least that is partly the reason.

21732. Do you know any case in which a Roman Catholic priest gives instruction in a school-house belonging to a Protestant manager?—No, I do not.

21733. The Lord Bishop of Meath—May I ask whether you are quite satisfied with the National system in the existing state?—I am, quite satisfied.

21734. You have no modification to recommend in the way of improvement?—No; I have directed my thoughts to several modifications that have been proposed, but I always concluded in favour of the present system in preference to them all.

21735. Are you satisfied with the books issued for the use of these schools?—Yes, at least I think that they are as good as we can have, in the present state of the country.

21736. Do you think that any additional books are required?—It never struck me that there were.

Dec 4, 1868.  
—  
The Very  
Rev James  
Byrne, A.M.,  
Dean of  
Gloucester.

21737 Do you think that the books, as they exist, are greeted with sufficient attention to the wants of the children?—Well I have always thought so.

21738 Mr. Gibson.—Had this school to which you referred in your answer to *Master Brookes*, been even in connection with the Kildare-place Society?—I think not.

21739 Are you aware whether it was the practice under the Kildare-place Society, for the same teacher to hear the reading-lesson either in the *Authorized Version* of the Scriptures, or in the *Dossy Version*, according to the wish of the child?—It is my impression that it was so; and I may mention that when I came to the parish of Cappagh, there was a National school there, under the patronage of the rector, in which the teacher was a Roman Catholic, and he gave religious instruction to the Protestants. I understood that he had been an old teacher under the Kildare-place Society, and it was in that way that his presence there was accounted for.

21740 Were you acquainted with the Kildare-place Society, or was it before your experience?—It was before my experience.

21741 I think you referred to the books of secular instruction as being a most important element in the united system, as administered by the Commissioners?—Yes.

21742 If the books, as you stated, were permeated with the teaching peculiar to a particular creed or denomination, the attendance of a child of a different creed at that school would, I need scarcely ask, affect his religious belief, so far as those secular books were concerned?—Yes, I think so.

21743 Now, I have here a book which has been prepared, called "*Burns' Standard Reading Book*, adapted to the requirements of the Revised Code, and containing exercises in writing, spelling, and arithmetic. Book Third." Look at that lesson on page twenty-five, the part about the Mass. Look over it. (Witness looks over the part of the book indicated.)

21744 This lesson represents a dialogue between Mary, a Protestant child, and Kitty, a little girl who has learned her Catechism well at school.—"Mary.—I often wonder, dear Kitty, why you go to Mass on Sundays. It seems so foolish to attend a service which you cannot understand. Do tell me a little about it. Kitty.—Not understand what the Mass is, Mary? Why, do you know that I have been going to school now for three years. Indeed, I know all about the Mass, thanks to our good, kind teacher. Mary.—Why, it is in Latin! Kitty.—Yes, Mary, but that makes no difference, as you will see if you think. You know we are told in the Bible how the High Priest used to offer sacrifice before all the people. Very few could hear his words, but they knew what he was doing, and they joined their intention with his. So when I hear mass, though I do not know what the priest is saying, I understand what he is doing, and I will make you understand, too, if you like." I presume that is altogether a controversial work?—In my opinion, yes; that goes into the degree of a *disputatio scholastica*.

21745 This is a secular book?—Yes; a secular book.

21746 Suppose this book was used for school instruction would a conscience clause, allowing the child to retire during the period of catechetical instruction, be of any service whatsoever?—I believe of no service whatsoever. At least it would not effectually prevent what the conscience clause was meant to guard against.

21747 Do you think that a book such as that if used in such a school would prevent Protestant children from attending at that school to receive secular instruction?—It ought to have that effect.

21748 Could a conscientious parent send his child to such a school as that without endangering the faith of his child?—I believe not.

21749 Sir Robert Keane.—In reference to the question put by Mr. Stokess as to the promotion of certain

teachers in the Omagh Model School, have you ever heard that those matters have been inquired into by the National Board?—I never heard.

21750 You are not aware?—I am not aware.

21751 Are they matters of which the National Board authorities ought to become cognizant?—While living there in the neighbourhood I never heard anything connected with the circumstances alluded to which reflected the least disgrace on the two women in question. I should not suppose that if that were so, if there were really nothing affecting their character, it would be necessary to investigate the circumstances.

21752 But do you not think that if there were anything affecting their character the National Board would not hesitate or neglect to institute a proper inquiry into it?—Certainly. I am sure they would not have hesitated to inquire.

21753 And you would therefore be disposed to conclude from the circumstances of an inquiry that you know of having been instituted, that persons officially responsible for the moral character of the masters and mistresses do not see any occasion for inquiry?—If no inquiry has been instituted, I should infer that there was no occasion for such inquiry on account of the known diligence of the Inspector who has the management of the model school.

21754 Do you consider that the duties of a clergyman in relation to the children of his parish belonging to his religion are limited strictly to the school-house, or to giving that proposition of religious instruction which can be commended in school?—No; certainly not.

21755 Is not religious instruction usually given by the pastors of the different religious denominations to the children of their flocks on Sundays after church time, in Sunday schools or otherwise?—I know it is by the clergy of the Established Church, and I presume it is by the clergy of other denominations.

21756 Does not that very effectively supplement such religious instruction as can be given under the arrangements of the schools?—It does; and yet I should consider it very desirable that there should also be daily religious instruction, but where, on Sunday, instruction is given, I could not regard the children by any means as being left unprotected.

21757 Then, in cases where, owing to any peculiar circumstances, a difficulty might arise as to the religious instruction of the minority of the schools, would it not become still more the duty of the pastor in charge of those children to look to their religious instruction being given on Sundays and at church?—Yes; and I presume that would make them anxious about those children.

21758 Would not the pastors generally of every denomination feel it their duty as ministers of religion to attend to such instruction?—Yes; I believe so, certainly.

21759 Mr. Stokes.—Did you understand me as reflecting on the character of the teachers?—As reflecting upon something that people might injuriously gossip about.

21760 Did I not in the case which I just describe the teacher as a victim of the misconduct of others?

21761 Mr. Stokes.—I should have read a little more from the book which I quoted a short while ago.—

"Mary.—You will be clever, if you can do that, Kitty, but you may try. Kitty.—When the priest comes out to my room, and stands inside the door and, I make the sign of the cross. When he begins to speak I try to think that I am going to be present at the very same sacrifice that was offered on Mount Calvary, when our Lord died on the cross. I think that his body and blood are going to be offered to God for his honor and glory, for a remembrance of his death, for obtaining pardon of all our sins, and grace for me and for the whole Church."

I should have gone on to read that at the 62nd; but I presume your answer to the mass, that it is purely controversial and proselyting?—Yes; that is what I should expect under a denominational system.

21762 Mr. Stokes.—Do you say that Protestants

Dec. 4, 1886.  
The Very  
Rev. James  
Byrne, A.M.,  
Dean of  
Cloyne.

who learn what Catholics really believe in controversial matters must of necessity abandon their own religion?—I believe that reading books in which the reasons for those doctrines are given, and given exclusively, would have a tendency to lead them to abandon their own religion.

21763 The Chairman.—Is there any other point which you wish to bring under the notice of the Commissioners?—I would like to make an observation on the demand that is made for the denominational system, apparently by all parties in the Kingdom. It is very frequently said that it is absurd to withhold that system when both the Roman Catholics and Protestants are calling out for it. Well, I believe that that fact is very much exaggerated, and that the feeling does not prevail amongst the laity of the different communities to the degree in which it appears. I believe that the desire for denominational education is rather a clerical idea, and I infer that with reference to the Roman Catholic Church, from the fact that it originated with the hierarchy, and that until the hierarchy expressed an opinion for denominational education the members of the Roman Catholic Church appeared perfectly content with the present system. And I believe that with reference to the Established Church, the fact is the same—that it is merely an expression of clerical opinion. I won't say merely, but that it does not pervade the laity to such an extent as would at first appear. That at least is my private opinion; and if such is the fact, that seems ought not to have much weight with the Government, as to the measure of education that they would adopt. Because, although in general it is most necessary for the Government to observe the wishes of the people, that arises from the fact that the people are the best judges of what suits themselves. And if this demand for denominational education arose from the laity, and were general through the country, then I think it ought to be respected, because the people ought to know what best suits themselves. But if it is principally a clerical demand then it is different.

21764 Do you think the lay subscribers of the Church Education Society are generally in favour of non-sectarian education?—No.

21765 Lord Glencoe.—Do you think that any person of either religion, Protestant or Roman Catholic, would be equally satisfied with instruction given to his or her child by a person differing from them in religion?—That the parents are indifferent on that subject?—No, I think the laity would be most anxious that their children should be instructed by teachers of their own religious belief.

21766 If that is the case, does not that rather tell against your opinion that the laity are indifferent on the education question?—No, I do not believe that the laity wish for a removal of the conscience clause. That is what I mean.

21767 Under a conscience clause you think they would be indifferent as to whether the teacher was of their own religion, or not?—Certainly not indifferent. Under the present system they have teachers of their own religious belief; however the number is vanishingly large to have a school at all. And under the present system, where their number is not sufficiently large to have a school, they are protected. So that I would suppose they prefer this system—not from indifference, but, on the contrary, from their anxiety about the religious welfare of their children.

21768 Am I to understand from you that they are equally satisfied whether the teacher is of the same religion with them or not?—Well, under the impossibility of having a teacher of their own religious belief, they value very highly the privilege of their children being secularly educated.

21769 That is, they would rather have that education than none?—Than none; or than the education in which they would be obliged to receive religious instruction contrary to their belief.

21770 Master Ansell.—Do you conceive that inspection is an important element in the prosperity of the schools?—I do, very important.

21771 Have you observed that a school left entirely to the master, in which no gentlemen, or lady, or clergyman takes any interest is very efficient?—The inspection which I consider to be highly important, is a really efficient inspection, such as is given by the Inspectors under the National Board, or by officers of that kind.

21772 I referred in my question to the daily or almost daily visits of some person who feels a lively interest in the school?—I think it is very salutary.

21773 Do you think the want of it deprives the school of a salutary influence and encouragement?—Well, I don't know, one of the best schools in my parish, it is under the patronage of the Roman Catholic priest, and it certainly has the best teacher; it is most efficient, and it is never visited by anyone.

21774 But the teacher is the best?—Yes.

21775 That is an exceptional case?—I think that the benefits of the patronage of the gentry are very much exaggerated; it is salutary, but I think the benefits are very much exaggerated.

21776 Are you aware that the Inspectors of the National Board constantly complain of the want of zeal and energy on the part of managers of schools under the National Board?—I was not aware.

21777 Also, that in some cases where Church Education schools have furnished under difficulties, the Inspectors of the National Board have said that it was owing to the zeal of the local patrons who visited the school and looked after it?—I think visitation from house to house, and the influence of a gentleman or lady in urging parents to send their children to a particular school, has a most powerful effect, and no doubt their presence in a school exercises a salutary influence.

21778 Or such attention on the part of the clergyman?—Yes.

21779 Who amongst the members of the community are the most likely to discharge that important function—are they not those who take the liveliest interest in the religious condition of the people?—Yes.

21780 The whole body of clergy of all denominations, and such laymen and women as take a lively interest in the subject?—I think so, they are the most likely.

21781 Don't you find that those persons who take the most lively interest in the progress of the children are the persons pressing for denominational education?—I think so.

21782 Then suppose I admit the fact you have stated that the majority of the laity are quite satisfied with the non-denominational system, on the other hand you would, I suppose, be willing to admit that the majority of the active patrons of schools, would be best pleased with the denominational system?—You would have the advantage of their support and patronage such as it was, but I believe that advantage would be infinitely outweighed by the evils that would arise.

21783 That is a point on which sincere men may fairly differ, I mean the relative weight of these conflicting considerations?—Certainly.

21784 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Where those schools of the Church Education Society have been well attended, have any extra inducements been held out to induce children of another denomination to attend, to Protestants or to Roman Catholics?—None that I know of in my parish.

21785 Has there been any kindness extended towards the poor children of these denominations, in the way of clothing and money, from time to time?—Well, as I said before, I had very little experience, for the schools did not live very long after I went there. But I am not aware of anything of the kind.

21786 Should you expect those clergy of the Established Church who took an interest in the Church Education schools previously, and have since identified themselves with the National Board, to continue their zeal and attention for the education of the poor in the National schools?—Certainly, if they gave their adhesion to the National system.

21787 As a matter of fact can you say they do?—Certainly.

Dec. 4, 1895.  
The Very  
Rev. James  
Byrne, A.M.  
Dean of  
Clonfert.

21788. Lord Bishop of Meath.—What do you mean exactly by the denominational system?—One, I mean, in which there is no conscience clause.

21789. A modification of the National system has been put forward upon high authority, of which this is an outline—that the secular education should be provided, directed, controlled, and enforced by the State—religious education to be provided and directed by the patron, clerical or lay, of each school. Do you think that such a modification would be likely to get rid of the objections that are made to the National system as it at present exists?—Yes.

21790. Would such a system as that which I have just sketched be likely to meet with general approbation in the country?—I think not, for I think it would be generally felt that the option of having a conscience clause, or not having it, should not be left to the patron.

21791. Mr. Gibbes.—Are you aware of any considerable body of Protestants in Ireland having lately made a declaration of adherence to the principle of mixed education?—I am.

21792. Is your signature to it?—I signed that declaration.

21793. Do you happen to have a copy of it?—Yes.

21794. Will you have the goodness to produce it, and give an analysis of the signatures?—The docu-

ment is produced. It is a declaration in favour of united secular education by members of the United Church of England and Ireland. There are 2,754 signatories.

21795. Lord Bishop of Meath.—What is the date of that?—April 9th, 1895.

21796. Mr. Gibbes.—Give the analysis of the signatures?—The Lord Primate of all Ireland, one; the Lord Justice of Appeal, one; noblemen, 45; bishops, 5; deputy-lieutenants, 146; justices of the peace, not deputy-lieutenants, 686; clergymen, 733; professional men, country gentlemen, and merchants, 800; miscellaneous signatures about 267. Total, 2,754.

21797. Mr. Stokes.—Is there a religious analysis?—No. They are all members of the United Church of England and Ireland. Shall I read the declaration?

21798. Mr. Gibbes.—If you please?—It is as follows:—

#### DECLARATION.

"We, the undersigned members of the United Church of England and Ireland desire to express our earnest hope that the principle of united secular education, as opposed to the denominational system, may be maintained in Ireland; without pledging ourselves to an approval of the National system in all respects, we entirely admit the justice and policy which protects scholars from interference with their religious principles, and thus enables the members of different denominations to receive together in harmony and peace the benefits of a good education."

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Casson Toole.

The Very Rev. LAURENCE CASSON TOOLE, of Manchester, is further examined.

21799. Minister Brooke.—I felt interested in the account you gave of your schools at Manchester, and I wished to ask you on one or two points. I see from the tests you put in that out of fifty children in the female school there were but two who were in their thirteenth year and but three in their twelfth year, all the rest were under eleven, and some considerably under eleven. Is that the case in the boys' school also?—Yes, the same. I have here the class tests of the boys' school, and you will see much the same on it. The boys may perhaps be kept a little longer at school. The girls of that class frequently find employment in nursing and other little domestic work, and they are perhaps generally removed from school rather earlier than the boys in the same rank.

21800. Have you the corresponding sheet for the boys?—Yes. (School tests handed in.)

21801. I see that only five out of fifty are beyond eleven years of age?—Yes. You remember, I said yesterday that sometimes boys after having been employed return to the school for a time. These cannot be claimed for in the grant.

21802. But still they are in this list?—They come in that list, but they are exempted afterwards.

21803. But upon the whole they are somewhat more advanced?—They are older. Boys often remain longer for the reason, that I say—that there is no such ready employment found for them in domestic work.

21804. You said something yesterday about a legal provision that led to a great transfer leaving the school about eleven years of age?—They are admitted as half-timers into the factories at eleven years of age. They are not admitted as full-timers till thirteen years of age. When they are half-timers the factory master is obliged to send them to school for half a day. They generally keep a school in the factory for the purpose, so as not to send them out.

21805. In fact, they are transferred?—They are transferred from one school to another.

21806. I wish to ask you about a matter that is very important with reference to our task here—that is, how much information you can generally get into the mind of a child that leaves you at eleven or twelve years of age?—The facility of reading, writing, and arithmetic, which, as I stated yesterday, I consider to

be the means of afterwards acquiring further knowledge.

21807. Do you find, in fact, that they read with facility when they leave you?—Yes.

21808. Could they take up a newspaper and read it?—If they remain until the sixth standard they can. A clever child in the fifth or fourth standard is worked on each year successively. Of course the education is much better grounded the longer they are over it. If we were to take them experimentally through what they might possibly do, then they would cease to have any claim upon the school after.

21809. A child that went to you at six years of age, and left at eleven, and was promoted every year, would be able to reach the sixth standard?—Yes, the fourth year.

21810. It was the general course, I think, you said, to promote in every year?—Yes, we have a large infant school now, and that gives great advantage. I mentioned an instance of a boy only seven years of age, and he is now in the third standard in the boys' school. He reads well. He was a year and three-quarters in the infant school. In the first three-quarters he was put into the first standard. He was rather too old for the gallery, as we call it. In the second year he was in the second standard. There is nothing higher than the second standard in the infant school. He begins now in the third standard, in the boys' school. He is not eight years of age. In four years he will be only eleven years of age, and he will have completed the whole course to the end of the sixth standard.

21811. I would rather hear about the dull children than the clever ones. They try the system now?—Of course the children who are dull are worked on so as to be capable of passing at the end of the year, otherwise we forfeit for them, and the test of whether the whole school is worked on or not rests entirely upon the result of the examination. Hence, taking the boys' school, I think, if I remember rightly, in the last year, when the number in average attendance was something about 215, or, perhaps, a little more than 200, the grant from the Committee of Council to the school was £196. Now, if you divide one with the other, it will show how nearly we approach to 15s., which is the highest that can be got.

Dec. 4, 1885.  
The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Gosse Test.

21812. I think you said that unless the child passes into the higher standard he is not paid for it?—If the child fails in either of the points of his examination that point is not paid for, and the child, whether he fails or not, must pass on into the next standard next year. If he fails again he is merely an unprofitable article in the school. For example, though he fails in standard three, he cannot remain in it—he must go on to standard four, and the master must have him prepared to pass in standard four next year, otherwise he is no benefit to the school.

21813. Mr. Stoker.—Has not the manager a right of withholding from an examination a dull child whom he does not consider prepared to pass in the standard?—Yes, but still I know it is my practice always to put them forward. I don't know what way be the practice with others.

21814. A child who has failed in standard two—you are not obliged to present that child in the following year in standard three, because you need not present him at all?—We are under the impression we must put him into standard three, but there is no recommendation from the State for him until he passes.

21815. Master Brooke.—Are you able at all to follow the career of the children after they leave you?—Very rarely in such a place as ours. Very rarely in a great town.

21816. What do you consider would be the state of literature, if I may use the expression, amongst the children who leave school at those early ages. Is there any general taste for reading amongst them?—Very little. In numbers of instances the children, after being away for a year or two, come back to the night-schools, where they find the consequences of their negligence. Under the revised code they must attain a greater certainty, or a greater positiveness in the results of reading than under the old system. When thoughtlessness on the negligence of parents causes the children to neglect the teaching, and they become weary of the loss after they are what they call free, some of them return to the night-school to try and recover what they have lost. Of course, many have sufficient skill to keep up what education they have received.

21817. Are the night-schools under your superintendence for adults?—Yes, those in the day-schools are always under thirteen years of age, otherwise the State has no interference with them; so those in the night-schools are over thirteen years of age. From thirteen to fifteen years of age they are careless—then they begin to get industrious again.

21818. Is there anything like an institution of lending libraries?—Yes, we have libraries in the schools. The books are chiefly given out in the Sunday school.

21819. Are they made use of by pupils who have left the school?—Yes.

21820. They are at liberty to consult?—Yes, and those who leave the school generally come to Sunday school; and those who have any taste for reading take our books, both boys and girls.

21821. Do many of them avail themselves of their privilege?—I cannot say the number; for I leave that in the hands of the teachers. There are perhaps 400 or 500 volumes in each library.

21822. I think you said yesterday that you considered reading, writing, and arithmetic, important as a mechanism for the future acquisition of knowledge, and that the moral and religious advancement of the mind were the only results you looked for, or rather the only results you could reasonably expect to achieve in your school?—Yes.

21823. That would make you more anxious that the moral and religious training should be diligently looked after, to make the most of it?—Yes; because, unless we attend to that very early, so as to make a good impression on them, we cannot hope to strengthen them against the temptations of a great town, and the inducements to carelessness and negligence to which they are continually exposed, for we hardly ever see them after.

21824. One of the lessons in one of the books

you mentioned as being in use in your school, the Third Book, contains the dialogue upon the Mass. How do you deal with that in the case of Protestant children?—When I was asked yesterday if there were any Protestants, I said there were a few. I asked the question in the school sometime ago, and I was told there were two, or three, or four. I can only say, as I said yesterday, we don't think of them at all.

21825. They read on like the rest of the children?—Yes, and they have their own schools within fifteen yards of ours to which they can go.

21826. That is their protection. They may go to their own schools?—Yes, if the parents wish to send them. If a Catholic parent sends his child to a Protestant school, it is his own act if the child be indoctrinated in the Protestant religion, where the Catholic is at liberty, and has power to send his children to a Catholic school, but instead of doing so, sends them to a Protestant school. I don't see that in the Protestant school they should make any change in the mode of teaching their own children on account of the presence of a few Catholics; so also I don't think we ought to be called upon to make any change in the teaching of our religion to our children because a Protestant chooses to send his child to the school, when he has a school of his own near at hand; but if there be only one school, and that a State-supported school, in the neighbourhood, and that there is a minority of religious dissimilitude in the neighbourhood, not able to provide themselves with a school either on account of their fervour, or their poverty, or on account of both, then in such a case there ought to be a provision for the protection of those who are helpless.

21827. You would exempt them only from the direct religious lessons?—Yes.

21828. You would not weed out such a passage as that on the Mass?—No; because I think that most important for our own people.

21829. I think you said you were not under any control by the Catholic Poor School Committee?—None, not in my school.

21830. May I ask whose control do you acknowledge?—None but the Committee of Council.

21831. I mean Ecclesiastical?—None but my own, in my own parish, in my own place; there is no further control than that, and the control of the Committee of Council.

21832. Are you in any way connected with the Jesuits' Society?—Not at all.

21833. The ladies who teach in your school you said belong to the same body as the nuns now established at Rathfarnham?—Yes, those who in this country are generally known as Loreto nuns; but Loreto is not the name of their order. It is merely the dedication of their houses.

21834. What is their correct style?—"The Institute of the Blessed Virgin for the Education of Youth."

21835. They are connected with the Jesuit body?—Not at all.

21836. You have not heard that?—No; and I knew they are not, for the Jesuits have nothing what ever to do with us.

21837. I can give you some information on the subject, though I am not a witness. I have visited the convent in Rathfarnham within the last month, and I was very kindly shown through it, and I found hanging up, a communication of privileges from the General of the Jesuits at Rome. It was regularly signed and framed, and hanging up in one of the rooms?—That may be; but they are not in any subordinate way connected with the Jesuits. Whether the General of the Jesuits in Rome may have any power conferred on him of granting some spiritual privilege, and may have done so there, I don't know. I have not the least idea of what you refer to, but if it be what I suppose, that is, merely the granting of a favour, that does not argue that the nuns are in any further connexion or communication with the Jesuit order, or dependent upon them, or in subordination to them, so more than they would be to any person who had performed any act of kindness

Dec 4, 1882

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Curran, Dublin

whatever for them. I positively state that they are not in any subordination or ecclesiastical connexion with the Jesuits. What they call their religious rule, so far as some of the principles of government among themselves exist, these are in a greater or less degree based upon the general rule known as the Constitution of the Jesuits, which provides almost all modern constitutions. It is looked upon as a sort of perfection of discipline in internal government, but further than that they have no connexion with them whatsoever. They are subject to the bishop of the diocese.

21838. The document in there I want you if it is a communication of graces and privileges. It is a regular printed form or lithographed form with blanks that may be filled up, and the blanks in this one are filled up with the name of the community in Rathfriland?—Yes, it may be probably something of this kind. Several of the religious orders have peculiar devotions that they originate or that are attached to them. The Jesuits have one of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and they have the power of granting community in prayer—community of association in that devotion—a participation in the spiritual privileges attached to it; but I, who have nothing whatever to do with the Jesuits, only being a member of the Catholic Church along with them, may have the same from them, but I have no subordination or connexion with them whatever beyond that of a common faith.

21839. Mr. Stokes.—Are you well acquainted with the history and rules of the community?—Yes, very well acquainted.

21840. With regard to the position of nuns as teachers in schools, is it not the fact that the Committee of Council look only to the managers as having the vote given in the schools?—Yes, so much so that the masters engaged by the managers and the paid teachers are entitled to the management.

21841. Where was taken in schools are they not equally under the control of the managers as other teachers?—Yes, just the same.

21842. Has not the manager the power of removing nuns in the same way as he has of removing other teachers?—Just the same.

21843. Are there not cases in which secular teachers have been succeeded by nuns on the one hand, and nuns have been succeeded by secular teachers on the other, just as the managers may from time to time think best for the education in their schools?—Several, I know several instances in which I could name them.

21844. Where such changes take place, is the Privy Council made aware that the school is taken from or given to nuns?—No, the Privy Council have nothing to do with that. The Privy Council is informed that there is a change of teachers—that Mary Smith is succeeded by Mary Jones, but nothing further. She must of course, be a certificated teacher, and the Committee of Council refer to their registry and see whether the teacher is a qualified person.

21845. Do you not consider that arrangement very desirable, as relieving the State from all responsibility of injury about religious persons, and leaving religious communities free from all interference on the part of the State?—Exceedingly desirable and beneficial. The perfect freedom we have is most satisfactory, and I am sure there is no injury to the work of the State; on the contrary, that they are sure of more excellent teachers for the children, and of a greater amount of good being done.

21846. Do you consider that if the Privy Council Office made payments directly to the teachers, so as to encourage in the teachers the notion that they were civil servants, the education of the people of England could be conducted with equally good results morally and religiously?—I don't think it would, because they would lose what I would consider the independent position of the local manager, and as the local superior is often the real owner of the place, he, if he were ill disposed, would be able to give a great deal of annoyance. I saw a letter this morning in a Dublin paper which reminds me of that very matter. A teacher claimed to be made in a great degree independent

of the authority under which he is employed. The effect I consider would be such as I have just stated in some instances to have occurred in France, where the teacher is completely independent of the clergyman, and where, though his life was immoral and the principles he inculcated upon the children were destructive of religion and injurious, of course, to what the clergyman held to be their welfare, yet that teacher might set that clergyman at defiance, and continue to do mischief under the protection of that independence he was supposed to have of the clergyman. In the letter I referred to yesterday, written by Mr. Kay, on the subject of the schools in Switzerland and Germany, he states that the teacher and the school are the assistants of the clergyman in the religious training. That must be, of course, a great advantage, but under the supposed system you have just suggested where the teachers would be, in a manner, independent, they would never be calculated upon as being the assistants of the clergyman, for they might, from any whim of their own, set themselves up in hostility.

21847. Mr. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware whether there is any practical difference between the position of managers of schools in Ireland and managers in England?—I don't know the peculiar position of managers in Ireland further than I stated yesterday. Practically I don't know it. I only know it theoretically from the reports and facts that have come to my knowledge at various times.

21848. In England are you obliged to supply a large portion of the funds for the payment of the teachers in your schools?—Yes, we must find it.

21849. Can you state the proportion of all the schools in England?—There is a general rule. We must find at least as much as the grant. The larger the school the more you have to find.

21850. So that in England the managers are responsible for a large portion of the payment to the teachers?—Yes.

21851. Are you aware that in the Irish schools the managers are not responsible for providing any portion of the payment for the teachers? If the teachers in Ireland are paid by the State, as I understood from you yesterday, of course the managers are not responsible?—If the schools and books are maintained and provided by the State there is nothing to be responsible for but good government and good conduct.

21852. Mr. Robert Lowe.—In that French case to which you referred, with whom would the diabolical of the ill-conducted schoolmaster rest?—I suppose with the Minister of Education or Religion, or whatever central authority appointed him. It is the resistance to this system of schools which has existed so long under the name of "liberty of instruction," that is, that the State should not administer the instruction as well as provide the funds.

21853. In such a case would not the representations of the clergyman with regard to the bad moral conduct of that teacher, receive attention?—Really, I cannot say; but in this case, as reported, and as I read it, they did not receive attention, because that was the ground of complaint, because the parish was still discredited by a man of immoral life being retained there. I merely saw the case as reported and commented upon, and I know that such was made the grounds of complaint from the party of which Count Montalembert was one.

21854. In the schools which you conduct in Manchester are you subject with regard to management to the bishop of the locality?—Not at all; we are entirely independent.

21855. Then you stand in the same position as a lay manager of a school?—Just the same.

21856. And you are only in relation with the Committee of Council?—Yes; if I were guilty of any ecclesiastical negligence, or guilty of any ecclesiastical misconduct, or that there was any complaint against my manner of conducting the schools, or of negligence on my part with regard to religious instruction, I should, of course, be liable to be spoken to, or inquired from, by my bishop, but further than that, not.



21857. Would that interposition of the bishop in your management of the school regard you as the clergyman, or as the school manager?—Merely as a clergyman, just the same as he might call me to account if I neglected to preach to my people on Sunday, or if I taught false doctrines to them.

21858. Is it simply in the relation of clergyman to bishop?—Simply in the ecclesiastical relation.

21859. The Inspectors of Roman Catholic schools such as yours, are all, I believe, in England, Roman Catholics?—All of them.

21860. Have the bishops any part in their nomination?—I stated yesterday the bishops had, but I believe that was a mistake. The Inspectors are selected and nominated by the Committee of Council, with the agreement, at second, or approbation, whatever you prefer to call it, of the Catholic Peer School Committee.

21861. Do you say it is not directly from the bishops?—Not directly from the bishops. The Peer School Committee is the medium between the Catholic body and the Committee of Council.

21862. Do you consider that the denomination and character of inspection is absolutely necessary for carrying on the system of primary education, such as exists in England?—I cannot say whether it is essential or not. I think it exceedingly desirable, and I know that it is very much praised by us.

21863. Has it, so far as you know or have heard, worked thoroughly well in England?—Perfectly well for anything I know to the contrary. I don't know any objection to it. It gives no confidence when our schools are visited by a Catholic Inspector, for he is a person whose religious feelings are in harmony with ours, and who sees and understands and knows what we are. This is important to us. He knows the peculiar tone of feeling with regard to Catholics; and how constantly we complain that we are not known or understood, or regarded, except in a very hostile way. With such an Inspector we are free from that. I said yesterday, when Mr. Bryon was quoted, that every gentleman was not like Mr. Bryon; therefore we avoid the possibility of any thing unpleasant by that arrangement.

21864. Does the Inspector report on religious instruction?—No, nor does he inquire into it.

21865. His functions are exclusively limited to the secular instruction?—Exclusively, and I believe it is the same in certain schools connected with Protestant denominations also. I think it is the same in some of those, that there is not a necessary inquiry into religion, but I am not sure. For instance, the Inspectors of the Church of England schools are distinguished from the Inspectors of Wesleyan schools, as the Inspectors of Church of England schools inquire into the religion of their schools.

21866. Were the functions of Inspectors so confined to secular instruction, would you consider it a grievance for the State to do away with the denomination and character of inspection, and to send yearly a Protestant gentleman to inspect your schools?—Yes; I should hold it so.

21867. Are you aware that the Commission which he recently reported upon the subject of primary education in the British Islands has recommended that inspection should not be denominational. I refer to the Duke of Argyll's Commission?—I don't know that. I stated yesterday that many of these questions with reference to denominational education, denominational inspection, ought to be regarded differently when you speak of or consider Protestants: in its various bodies or various shades of doctrine, and when you consider the difference between Protestants and Catholics. There is a general agreement amongst Protestants, whilst between Protestants and Catholics there is an entire disagreement of first principles.

21868. Where the whole instruction in a school is permeated with the religious element, which I believe is the case in your school, does it not become extremely difficult for the Inspector to report upon the secular instruction, unless, at the same time, he can appreciate and sympathize with the religious element, which

forms so important a portion of it?—No; because the examination of the Inspector has no reference, and bears no reference whatever to the religious instruction. His examination consists of inquiring into the writing, the reading, and the arithmetic. If there be a special class for examination in grammar, or in geography, or in reading, when the child comes forward, the Inspector tells the child what page to read from. If the child reads satisfactorily it is marked. If he writes upon the slate in arithmetic it is marked. If he does a sum in arithmetic satisfactorily there is a mark. It is marked that the child has passed in the three points. If the examination be in English grammar, the children are called, one with the other, and examined in the grammar. Of course no religious matter comes directly into any of these subjects, and therefore the Inspector has nothing to report upon respecting religious instruction.

21869. Do you think the independence of the Inspector is sufficiently secured by the process of their being subject to the vote of a religious body?—I think the Inspectors are perfectly independent. It is not so much a vote as that there shall not be named a person who may be objectionable. There is no vote. I think it is an agreement that the person appointed by the Committee of Council shall not be an objectionable person. The Inspector is perfectly independent. He owes no allegiance whatever to the Peer School Committee. To the Committee of Council only is he accountable, and I must say that, once he is appointed, I don't see what further the Peer School Committee have ever to say to him. They merely have to consent to his appointment at first. They rarely see that the person is not objectionable, and he is perfectly independent, as he ought to be.

21870. You attach considerable importance to the fact of the Inspectors being denominational, and you consider it useful for promoting the success of the system of education?—It was so considered and so resolved on by our superiors. When we first commenced to come into connection with the Committee of Council, and neither my position nor any thought I have given to it would give me any title whatever to say anything to the contrary, and I can only say that all I have heard express themselves on the subject are satisfied with matters as they are.

21871. Mr. Justice Morris.—Can the second order of the Roman Catholic clergy establish a school without the previous permission of the bishop?—Yes. We know, without having it expressed in every case, that it is the wish of the bishop, if a school be not already in existence where the point is, that he shall establish one as quickly as possible. And all that is requisite is this, that when a clergyman wishes to establish a school, of course he must endeavour to raise the funds, and he asks the bishop's permission to make collections for the purpose, which permission is never refused.

21872. I do not refer to a permission to collect funds; but do you ask his permission in consequence of his being a bishop, to establish a school?—No.

21873. It is the course of conduct consistently with Catholic doctrine, as explained by some bishops here, that the bishops decide altogether upon questions of education, in the total exclusion of the second order of the clergy?—But that is not a question of education, it is a question of school-building.

21874. Of having schools, and of the mode of conducting them?—That is a question merely of school-building, where there is a tacit consent. We stand in need of schools; we know it is the wish of the bishop that we shall have schools wherever we can, and therefore there is no occasion to ask him "shall I, must I, ought I have a school?" We know already what the answer will be. But if we go to him and say—"My lord, it is very desirable we shall have a school in such a place." If he thought not he would say—"I think not." But the school being wanted, the priest would say—"I suppose I am at liberty to collect for that purpose?" He says—"Yes." You just now made use of the word "doctrine." You mean "discipline," I presume.

Dec. 4, 1860

The Very  
Rev. Laurence  
Canon Toole.

21875. No, I mean doctrine?—I don't see what it has to do with doctrine. The bishop of another diocese has a perfect right to say to his clergy, you must not think of building a school till you ask me. That is matter of discipline. Our bishop does not say anything of the kind. He is only anxious that we should have a great number of schools, and he leaves us to ourselves.

21876. Did I understand you aright to say that you, as manager of the school, managed it without being under the jurisdiction or control of the bishop?—I cannot see the point of the question. Do you mean that I am not under the jurisdiction of the bishop, or that that particular act does not come under his special cognisance?

21877. Had you ever the management of a school under his jurisdiction?—As a priest, serving in one of his churches, of course I am entirely under his jurisdiction. My act there as manager is that of a clergyman acting under his jurisdiction, but I don't submit each individual act that I do to him. I am a person in a position. I have the general management of the whole parish in my hands. If I do anything contrary to law I am liable to be called to account, but unless I do something contrary to law I am not.

21878. But, in imparting education, and of course, religious education, in your schools, you are aware that the bishop is the exclusive authority to decide upon the system of education?—No; I don't know what you mean by a system of education of imparting religious instruction or religious education in the school. I am, of course, subject to the bishop and the Church that I shall not instruct in or teach anything contrary to Catholic faith or morals. As to my mode of doing it, of course, just as there is a difference in the style of language of two different men, the bishop has no control over the style of language a priest may use or his manner of putting his arguments. So he has no control whatever over the special forms of instruction. He could not possibly have it. Every man must be allowed to act his own way.

21879. How is that consistent with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that the bishop

is to be the judge of the system and the mode of giving education?—If you would show me the passage—because I know that sometimes words are so misinterpreted or misapplied—if you could show me the passage, so that I might take it in all its bearings, I could give an answer. I could not give an answer to a question put in so abstract a form, and yet on leading so much.

21880. Is it one of the decrees of the Council of Trent, or in the Catechism of Pope Pius, which are generally considered to contain the rules governing the Catholic Church, that the bishop is to be the exclusive person to decide on teaching without any interference whatever on the part of the second order of the clergy?—What do you mean by teaching?

21881. Religious teaching in a school?—Of course the bishop is the supreme teacher, because it was to the Apostles the first commission was given. Therefore the bishops amongst us, who hold these powers, they have the supreme power of teaching, and we are accountable to them for it.

21882. Then it results in the fact that you are accountable to the bishop?—In every organized society the subordinates are always accountable to their superiors, I presume.

21883. But in this case it does not arise from superiority of degree merely, but from the fact of its being a doctrine of the Church?—No, it arises from the superiority of degree and the function attached to that. You must know that the second order of the clergy are merely persons who are invested with a portion of the functions belonging to the higher order, or the Episcopate. Therefore the supreme jurisdiction rests with them. We are their assistants in the work.

21884. My *Dominé*.—Is not the state of the schools and of education in the parish invariably one of the matters into which the bishop inquires of the clergyman of the parish on his visitation?—Yes, on the visitation.

21885. You, I presume, as the clergyman, recognise the bishop's authority to raise the question, and to act it as far as it is desirable?—Most certainly.

THE REV. JOHN McMANIS, F.F., SWORN AND EXAMINED.

The Rev.  
John  
McManis,  
F.F.

21886. The *Clergyman*.—What is the parish of which you are the priest?—Stranorlar, in the county Donegal.

21887. Have you any schools under your management connected with the National Board?—I have six schools in the parish where I am at present in connexion with the National Board.

21888. Have you any admixture of Protestant pupils?—There is some admixture of Protestant pupils in some of the schools.

21889. To any extent?—No, except in one school. There it is about one-fourth of the whole. In the other schools I may say they are exclusively Roman Catholic.

21890. Is there any school under Presbyterian management in your parish in connexion with the National Board?—I believe not.

21891. Is there any school belonging to any other society or body?—Yes; the Episcopians have their schools in connexion with the Church under their own management and direction; and there are schools partially supported by the paternal landlord of the place, Sir Samuel Hayes, from private grants, from what source derived I don't know; and the Presbyterian body have also a school of their own. I cannot be perfectly certain that it is not in connexion with the National Board, but I think it is not.

21892. Is your school, in which you say about one-fourth of the children are Protestants, in the neighbourhood of any of those other schools?—No; it is not; it is about a mile and a half from any of the other schools.

21893. In that school where you have this admixture of religions, do you find any trouble or difficulty in carrying on the school, on account of the rules of the National Board relating to religious instruction?—

I am only about a year and four months in the parish, and after I was appointed to the parish, I found this practice going on, that the Catholic teacher was teaching the Protestant Catechism and the Protestant version of the Bible to the Protestant children.

21894. During separate hours?—Yes, by direction of the parents of the children.

21895. Then, during the time he was so occupied with the Protestant children, what were the Roman Catholic children doing?—They had left the school, I think, at the time.

21896. Was this done every day, or only one day in the week?—I cannot say how many days in the week it was done. It was unknown to me at first. When I heard of it I objected to it, thinking it was not right for a Catholic teacher to be giving instruction in books in which he did not believe. I found also, on speaking to him, that he had a conscientious objection to it himself while he was doing it; and I think the reason why he submitted to it at all was, that the attendance at the school was not very large, and he was afraid that if he did not do it the children might be withdrawn, and he would suffer, by his salary being reduced in consequence of the rules of the Board requiring a certain minimum of attendance to secure the salary. I believe that was his motive.

21897. Were most of these Protestant children paying school-fees?—I think not; some were and some not, but the school-fees altogether are very trifling.

21898. Does the practice continue?—When I objected to it he discontinued it. In fact, I think, he understood or began to think it would not be pleasing to me before I met him at all, and he had discontinued it without any particular instruction from me.

21899. Are you in favour of the present system of

the National Board?—No, neither in all its details and bearings, nor in the system itself; of course, to a certain extent, we have favoured it by adopting it, but that was because it was the only one we could avail ourselves of. We would almost have had no education if we had rejected it. I am not in favour of what is called the mixed system, if it could possibly be avoided. I would much prefer that the children of my own religious denomination be instructed by a Catholic teacher—taught exclusively by themselves.

21900. Settling aside the question of model schools to which different objections apply, are you in favour of the denominational system for the ordinary primary schools?—Decidedly, and I believe that is the universal feeling of the priests of our diocese.

21901. Supposing any change were made in that direction, what provision would you suggest should be made for small Protestant minorities when they are not sufficiently numerous to maintain a school of their own?—There would be a difficulty always in some localities about that, but, I think, if this system were introduced, viz., that a person getting up a school, and having the management and care of it, could have his own people trained up in his own way by religious instruction, and by the introduction of books of a superior stamp to those we have in the schools at the present time; and that there was a rule made that the Protestant children should never be allowed to be present when religious instruction was being given by a Catholic teacher—nor Catholic children allowed to be present at religious instruction given by a Protestant teacher—I think it would obviate a great deal of the difficulty. I would not like to make it so exclusive as to prevent any child having an opportunity of getting education; I think it would be right they should have the opportunity, but guarded so that there could be no interference with the religion of any child.

21902. Do you think you could so divide secular and religious instruction that a Protestant child could learn to read, write, and cipher, while at the same time you could communicate sufficient religious instruction to your flock?—Well, I think so; I think there would not be much difficulty in doing that.

21903. Have you ever been connected with districts of the country where Protestants are in the majority and where Roman Catholics are in the minority, and so unable to maintain schools of their own?—No, I was not. I officiated for fourteen years in the parish of Killybrenn, at Ballyshannon; I was afterwards, for six years, the administrator under the late Dr. McGeigan, in the parish of Letterkenry. Subsequently, for about six years, I was parish priest of the united parishes of Rugeley and Convey—there the population is very much mixed. About a year and a half ago I was transferred to my present parish of Stenoula, which is still lying alongside the parish of Convey. In all these places the different religious denominations had schools of their own, and there is less of admixture in the schools of my present parish than there was in any of the others. I should say that I find every year that the Protestants, especially the Presbyterians, are making themselves with the Board more than they did formerly, and are getting up schools of their own, and under their own management, and are endeavouring to draw their own children to their own schools, as far as practicable. And thus the system is gradually becoming more denominational.

21904. And as far as your experience goes do you consider that the schools are gradually acquiring in many places a more denominational character?—Decidedly. That is my experience in all parts of the country.

21905. As far as your experience goes do you think education in mixed schools has the effect of making the children indifferent in religious matters?—I think it has, and I think besides it can scarcely be carried on with perfect safety. I would give one instance that came to my knowledge, not personally, but came to me from a Catholic Inspector in reference to a school conducted by a Presbyterian teacher. He was teaching a class by direction of the Inspector in the school, the majority

of the children were Catholics; the lesson he was teaching was in the Second Book, and this passage occurred—"And Abraham built an altar, and worshipped the Lord." The Inspector caused him to explain the lesson to the children, and the explanation he gave was this—that altars were formerly required for the purposes of worship—for sacrifices. That, of course, implied indirectly that altars were not now required at all—that such things were not in existence for sacrifice; and the Inspector told me that he believed the teacher was a very conscientious man, that he did not intend, directly or indirectly, to communicate anything that would appear to be erroneous to any of the children, and that he believed it was from ignorance of the Catholic doctrine. He told me that was his impression.

21906. Would a careful explanation of that sort restrain on the minds of the children, or shake their belief?—They might be so young as that it would make no impression on them, but I know such impressions do last on the minds of children, and they retain them. Of course by other instruction those impressions may be removed. I know that from my boyhood days I always looked up with a great deal of respect to my teacher. And I know when children respect their teacher they imitate him in his very tone and manner—his mode of expression and mode of thoughts as far as possible, and a teacher has a decided influence upon them. I speak from my own knowledge.

21907. Do you think the regulations of the National Board are sufficient to prevent proselytism in the schools?—I do not think they are. I think the instance I have already given shows that. The rule of the Board still leaves an opening for proselytism, and practically it may be carried on in some schools by the teachers. And although certificates are required to be signed by parents or guardians, it is not a sufficient safeguard in certain cases, for it gives the teachers an opportunity of inculcating erroneous doctrines, if I might call them so, at least contrary doctrines. It gives them an opportunity of instructing children in principles contrary to their creed and faith.

21908. Do you consider, on a matter of that kind, that there are many cases now in which there is a deliberate desire of proselytism, either on the part of teachers or managers of National schools?—I don't think the teachers wish to interfere much, if there was no pressure put upon them. I think they would rather get rid of the difficulty and the cause of teaching religion at all. That is my impression.

21909. Do you think there are many managers who are using decidedly the National schools as an instrument of proselytism?—I cannot directly speak from my own knowledge. If I were to draw an inference from one fact, I have observed Presbyterian ministers denouncing strongly the Catholic bishops for seeking separate education, and in their public speeches ranting very strongly on the necessity of united education, while these very gentlemen are getting up schools as fast as they can for the purpose of having separate education, or having schools under their management where there were schools under Catholic priests. They either dreaded there was some danger of their children attending schools under Catholic priests, or as is generally believed by Catholics, they desired to have schools under themselves, for the purpose of proselytism, but that is mere inference. I cannot speak of direct cases.

21910. Mr. Seddon.—Have you any objection to mention the names of any of the persons who are acting as patrons in the county Donegal, where they built schools in that way? Can you mention any particular person?—I know one instance—that of the Rev. Oliver Leach, of Letterkenry.

21911. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In what parish is Letterkenry, may I ask?—Conwell.

21912. Mr. Beane.—Have any serious difficulties arisen in consequence of the present mode of training teachers that is adopted, or have you any suggestion to make as to an alteration of that system, that would be acceptable to the Catholic body?—I think the teachers are at a great loss from the want of training—I mean the

Dec. 4, 1886.

The Rev.  
John  
McMonaglin.  
p. 2.

Dec. 4, 1868.

The Rev.  
John  
McManis,  
r.f.

Catholic teachers. I think it would be a great advantage if they were trained, and I presume, you are aware, gentlemen, that the Catholic bishops have recommended Catholic managers, from sending their teachers for training, and I think the teachers have sustained a loss from not getting training, and the only way of getting out of the difficulty would be if there was a separate training establishment for the Catholics. I think it would be advantageous to them and would add to their efficiency.

21913 Do you find, practically, the efficiency of the teachers in the Catholic schools has been affected by the fact of their not having had training? Would you prefer in a school of your own to have a trained teacher to an untrained one?—I would, decidedly; and I would not only say if there was a training establishment for the Catholic teachers, they should be trained for six months or so, as at present, but I would reserve the time to ten or twelve months at least, for I think it would add much to their efficiency.

21914 Are there any special points of objection to the school books, the books now in use by the National Board, to which you could call the attention of the Commission?—The books, in the first place, exclude everything that bears upon Catholicity in any way. The child whose reading is confined to the school books, knows nothing of his Church,—nothing of its history,—nothing of the Catholic world, beyond the mere locality in which he lives, nor of the history of his country, past or present. All that is shut out from him, and he is deprived of anything connected with the history of the Church,—or history of the Irish Catholic people, when they go abroad. He has no opportunity of knowing anything whatever of their successes or failures, or their position in foreign countries, and I think that is a great want. I think to have Catholics properly brought up, they must from infancy be imbued with the spirit of the Catholic religion. I think it must be positively inculcated upon them, and I think more active teaching, such as they get from the books in the National schools, can never make them good, peasant Catholics. It leaves them, so far as the teaching goes, entirely blank, and everything connected with the Church, and appertaining to it, they have no opportunity of knowing anything in the schools. It shuts out from them every kind of history, and I think that is injurious to them in afterlife. They grow up ignorant of history, until they begin with reading newspapers, and periodicals, and very often violent articles, and they adopt those isolated one-sided views without due reflection, and I think it drops them very often into evil associations, and combinations, and fits them to become the dupes of designing and evil companions. I think it has a bad social effect upon them in afterlife, because they have no knowledge of history to enable them to weigh matters, and form a fair judgment. They are led away by bad impulses as it were, when the light of day breaks in upon them. The present school books cannot prepare a boy for the middle or higher class schools.

21915 Have you any personal knowledge of the books that are in use in the Christian Brothers' schools?—I have never read them all attentively. I cannot speak of the merits of their whole series of books. We have no branch of the Christian Brothers in our diocese.

21916 There is a practical difficulty I believe—as there is, in getting Christian Brothers' schools established in some districts?—Yes, there is a great difficulty, first, in the building of schools and residences for the Brothers, and then in getting the annual support for them, and also from the insufficient supply of the Brothers.

21917 I suppose, taking it altogether, that part of the country from which you come, county Donegal, is one that as regards the Roman Catholic residents in it, may be called a poor part of Ireland?—Very poor. That is too well known.

21918 And very few Catholic residents in it except of the quite poor people?—They are generally altogether of the poorer class.

21919 Have you any remark that you wish to make to the Commission, as regards the position or salaries of the teachers, or as to whether or not you consider them adequate?—I think the teachers are very inadequately paid. In our county the teachers get very very little in the shape of school-fee, from the great poverty of the people, except from perhaps, £4 to £6 or £8, and it is only in rare instances it would amount to £6 in the entire year. They depend entirely—almost exclusively—on the salary from the Board—and that salary is quite insufficient, I think, to encourage a young man, or induce a young man to remain in connexion with the Board, and I know young men who have got a fair education, will prefer to emigrate, unless they are labouring under some bodily defect.

21920 Has it come under your notice that the teachers are dissatisfied with their position in other respects, besides what they consider inadequacy of salary? Have you ever heard teachers complain, individually or collectively, of what they consider the injurious exercise of power on the part of managers?—I have observed that in the *National Teachers' Journal*. The teachers have established a sort of journal of their own, supported by themselves, and I see there that the teachers are anxious that they should be made officers of the Board of Education directly, or, at least, that they would not be liable to be dismissed without cause proved against them. I have heard also from some teachers that it is a sort of general feeling, and I have heard it too from Inspectors.

21921 Do you consider, so far as your knowledge of the matter extends, that this complaint of the teachers is founded upon justice?—I don't know any good reason they have for it. I have, since I first became connected with the National Board as manager, had about thirty-five teachers under me. I have been always anxious to promote their interest whenever I was able to do it, in the way of getting a residence or assisting them, I did it, and I never dismissed a teacher but one. I necessarily dismissed one teacher, and I would have been sorry to establish the case by proving it before any tribunal. I may mention the circumstances. I had ascertained beyond doubt that a young teacher had become a member of an illegal society—a Ribbon society—and I could not tolerate such a person as teacher of the children, and I thought that being under my patronage, and going amongst the young men of the neighbourhood, it would have an injurious effect, and was calculated to appear to have my sanction and countenance, and I therefore thought his conduct should be stamped with my disapprobation. I did it necessary to dismiss him. If I had been obliged to show cause against him, I would have had great difficulty to give up the name of the informant, and also to get him to come forward and prove it, and I know I would have ruined the character of the young man, independently of marking him out for public prosecution. Another instance of the same kind occurred, not under myself, but under a manager in an adjoining parish. That was a still more delicate affair. There were two schools together—a male and a female school—and both teachers were young unmarried persons, and the manager became jealous that a sort of intimacy was growing up between them. He found that the male teacher was visiting the apartments of the female after and before school hours, and that this was regularly going on for some time. To get rid of one of them was a matter of necessity, and the manager took steps for that purpose. He had admonished them previously, but he wished to manage to get rid of the difficulty without doing anything prejudicial to either party. He found there was a female school in an adjoining parish vacant, and he applied to the manager of that school to receive the female teacher, he did so, and neither party suffered in character or otherwise. If the manager had gone before any board of inquiry and established his case by proof, it would have been ruinous to both teachers.

21922 Do you think on individual hardship is likely to arise to a teacher from the fact of the manager having the power, without any notice, of dismissing

from the school?—So far as my knowledge goes I never knew, nor did it ever come under my notice, from teachers or managers or any party, that any manager dismissed a teacher in that arbitrary way, unless as I said there was some great necessity for it.

21923 Lord Clarendon.—Would you or anybody else like to accept the office of manager if you understood the teacher was not subject to your sole authority?—I don't think the school would work so well or so efficiently. If a rule were established depriving us of such authority, we should have to do the best we could; but I don't think any manager would like it, and I should think besides that it would not work well. I think the fact of the teacher being under the control of the manager makes him attentive to his work and careful, and makes him attend at all proper hours. I will give an illustration perhaps of that, where I met a slothful, negligent teacher. I found he lived a mile and a half from the school—that he was not in the habit of going to the school until nearly ten o'clock, and that the children had no means of knowing when he would arrive. I heard from the parents that the children were kept waiting under the rain in very cold weather, and the teacher would not come in time. If he had acted up to the rules he should have been there at half-past nine. The children were kept standing in the cold, half naked and barefooted, and the result was that they would not come out then until near eleven o'clock. When I understood that this was the case, I made it my business to go promptly to the school for several mornings, to see if I could try and catch him absent. He found that I was watching him, and he attended to the school, knowing that I could dismiss him. I believe if the teachers were entirely from under our control, and that we could not dismiss them without proving glaring causes against them, they would not be so attentive.

21924 Mr. Dwyer.—Do you think any advantage would arise from the fact of the manager being obliged to give a month's notice or a month's salary to the teacher as is done in the case of other servants?—Perhaps, as a general rule, there would be no inconvenience in it, and not many managers would object, but I think I have given cases where it would be inconvenient to be under the necessity of doing so.

21925 You would have the option or alternative of giving a month's salary instead of a notice, supposing you did not want to keep him?—I think managers would have a decided objection to be obliged to pay a month's salary out of their own pockets. We have too much to do already.

21926 I do not mean necessarily that the money should be paid out of the manager's pocket. Don't you think it would be fair to the teacher that he should not be in the position of possibly being obliged to go away on a Monday morning without any previous notice? Would it not be fair that he should be under either of receiving a month's notice, during which time he could look for another place, or that he should receive a month's salary?—And that to be paid by the Board?

21927 I am putting it without saying who is to pay it?—I object to the manager paying it, because we have to do more than we are able. In many cases in the country we have to build the schools at our sole expense.

21928 The Chairman.—Why not give the same notice to a teacher as to a domestic servant?—It is not necessary, even in every instance, for a domestic servant. If a domestic servant commits a gross breach of duty, it is not necessary I think to do it. I can scarcely realise any manager being so harsh as to dismiss a teacher without recommending or disapproving him. I cannot imagine any manager dismissing a teacher summarily without good cause. I don't think such a person is to be found. For my part I would be sorry to do it.

21929 Mr. Dwyer.—Have you known cases where difficulty has arisen in obtaining sites for National or other schools?—I have partially referred to that already, because I said that in many instances in our country we are obliged to build our own schools at our sole expense, and keep them in repair, because we

could not get leases from landlords of such tenure as to enable us to get grants from the Board. In some cases, where the landlords would not give leases, not wishing to identify themselves with the system, they would give a sort of permission, or at least connive at building schools on their property. I built two schools on the property of Colonel Connolly, on his Ballyshannon estate in that way. I spoke to the agent, who was in favour of the system, and could get no lease for the reasons assigned.

21930 You consulted the agent?—The agent told me—"If you want to build a school, you can go and do it, and if I throw down the school, I will indemnify you for your loss." There was no school thrown down, but considering the poverty of the place, it was difficult to have them built.

21931 Have you ever met a case where an individual, being a large landed proprietor in a district, having an objection to—we will suppose the National system of education—refused sites for schools, and, by so doing, prevented National schools being erected on his property, and thus deprived a considerable district around of the possibility of having a school?—Yes; I knew a landlord who would not allow it—Sir Samuel Hayes and his father, the late Sir Edward Hayes. I wanted to build a school in a remote district, in the last parish I was in on his property, but I would not be allowed. I wanted to build a good school, one that would cost £30 or £50. There was a large number of families in the district. They belonged partly to my parish, and partly to the adjoining one. The priest of the adjoining parish offered to join me in building a school. There was no school, public or private, National or otherwise, within three and a half miles in any direction to this group of people who lived away in the middle of the mountains.

We were anxious to get a school for them, and I applied to a tenant to be allowed to build a school on his farm. He said he would most cheerfully grant it, adding, "I have a number of children, and it would be a great boon to me." I met afterwards the agent of Sir Samuel Hayes, and I told the circumstances to him, and asked would he sanction it. He said he would not say, but he would consult the landlord, and when I met him again, he told me he could give no permission. The landlord on the adjoining property was an absentee. He was not living there, nor was his agent, and we took our chance, obtained permission from a tenant farmer, and built a school on the other landlord's property, that of Mr. Paddy, of Kingscourt, in the county Cavan. We built it without asking leave, and it has not been disturbed.

21932 If it had so happened that the property you allude to had been even greater than it was in extent, and had embraced a district of many square miles, so is not uncommon in mountainous districts, would not the result have been that the entire population of that district would have been absolutely deprived of education?—It would, but I do not see any remedy. If the property had extended further I could not have built on it, and these never was a National school built on it, except in two instances where tenants who had leases granted sites.

21933 Do you think that that right of practically depriving the population of education is one that ought to exist?—It is very harsh at all events, for of all the people in the country it is people circumstanced as the poor people to whom I have already referred who should be provided for, and I think when the Government undertake to educate the population at all, it is those who ought to be looked to first.

21934 Lord Clarendon.—If a landlord was so prone to build a school on his property, on the condition that he should be patron of that school, would you accept such an offer as that? I am now speaking as to his interference with religious education, but supposing he proposed to introduce a school on his property, and appoint a Roman Catholic master, and wish to be patron of his own school, would you accept the offer?—It would depend very much on the character of the landlord, so far as I would go. If he were a

Dec 4, 1864  
The Rev.  
John  
McManus,  
P.P.

Dec. 4, 1888.

The Rev.  
John  
McDonnell,  
P. P.

liberal, tolerant man, I would not see much objection. If he were the reverse he would have the power to cause him to attend the school, and he might introduce things that would be objectionable, and he could change the teacher at pleasure.

21935 I mean that it was under the National Board?—Yes, even under the National Board. I knew a school where the landlord is manager and patron. The teacher is a Presbyterian, but the people all around are his tenants—has four labourers and his dependents, and, as a fact, several of the Catholic parents have gone in, and signed the usual certificate required by the Board, authorizing a Presbyterian teacher to teach Catholic children the Protestant Catechism and the Protestant version of the Bible; and I believe that that is owing to the fear the people are under, and the apprehensions they are under of the displeasure of their landlord and employer. I think your proposal is liable to abuse in that way. I cannot of course go into the motives of any party, but I state the fact, that if the people were free, and knew what they were doing they would not allow their children to attend the religious instruction in the manner I have stated.

21936 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is that a National school?—Yes.

21937 And are those children receiving the instruction with the consent of the parents?—Yes. It is not in my parish, and I had a difficulty in making very particular inquiry. I would scarcely think it fair to go into another clergyman's parish to take up a thing of the kind. It is only a few weeks since it came to my knowledge. I had no opportunity of seeing the clergyman of the parish, or of knowing that he was aware of what was going on, but I am aware of the fact.

21938 Lord O'Shevagh.—Supposing the patron had appointed a Roman Catholic teacher to his school, and that the school was under the protection of the National Board you would not attribute much evil to it?—No, not so long as the Roman Catholic teacher was there, and provided the rules of the Board were adhered to.

21939 Of course you are aware that there have been objections even notwithstanding such a proposal as that, and that Protestant patrons are not readily admitted by the Roman Catholics?—I think they are generally admitted with great suspicion. It depends very much on the character of the particular patron.

21940 In this respect that prevents you accepting Protestant patrons as patrons of schools on their property, do not you think it a great hindrance to sites of schools being given on those properties?—I am not aware it was ever refused on that ground—at least that reason was never assigned to me. I applied in three instances. I applied, as I have told you in the case of Colonel Connolly, and he was politically and in principle adverse to the system. That was the reason assigned by the agent, and he thought if he persisted, and in private life gave sites and leases for the building of schools under the Board it would be an inconsistency.

21941 As a matter of fact do not you think that a proprietor has a very fair claim to ask to be patron of a school he builds himself?—I think he has some claim if he built it himself, but I think if I have to build a school, and collect the money, I would have an objection to any other being patron of the school.

21942 Mr. Deane.—The case I was asking about were the cases where no farther aid was given than the letting of the site?—Neither sites or leases would be given in the instance I have given, nor were any National schools sanctioned by the landlords, or erected by themselves.

21943 Do you think that the right of absolutely preventing education when it was of no pecuniary loss to himself, is a right that ought to be left in the hands of any individual?—I think if we had a law to compel a landlord to give the ground at a fair rent, more schools would be connected with the Board, and a better class of schools—in more localities, and more comfort-

able than they are now. If there was a compulsory clause it would be beneficial in that way, and I do not think a proprietor should have the power of depriving the people or any portion of them of an opportunity of receiving education.

21944 Lord O'Shevagh.—Suppose an arbitrary law were introduced would it not be just that the opportunity should be given to a landlord to be patron of a school built on his own property?—If he applied for a school he might build it, but to get children into a school where the trust is entirely Catholic, it would depend on the character of the man whether the children could be entrusted under his management, with all the safeguards of the Board as at present.

21945 Mr. Deane.—I think you were at one time in the parish of Convey?—I was.

21946 Was there a school there—an agricultural school or a school to which land was attached, and where agriculture was professed to be taught?—Not in the parish of Convey. There was at Curlew, Letterkenney. There was an agricultural school at Convey, but it ceased to be an agricultural school about ten or twelve years before I went to that parish at all. The agricultural department had been entirely given up, and it was only a literary school in my time.

21947 You know nothing of the working of that agricultural school?—Nothing whatever, for it had been given up before I went there.

21948 Do you think it would be a beneficial thing to the position of the teachers if they were to get a house or portion of their salary or as portion of any addition they might get to their present salaries?—Yes; undoubtedly.

21949 Do you think it would be desirable to have a small portion of land added, say two statute acres?—Yes. It would tend very much to enable them to support their families.

21950 You don't see any objection to their having so much land?—I do not. I could not see any objection at the present time. I have never known any injury to result from it in some few instances where the teachers had residences, and a small piece of land attached. The only question that at present would suggest itself to me is that in a case where a teacher had misconducted himself it would be more difficult to remove him, but I think if the manager had control of the house he could make terms with the teacher by making him a weekly tenant at a nominal rent, and even if he never evicted it, he could put him out.

21951 If the manager reserved the right of depriving the teacher of the house at any time of the year, would it not be desirable that there should be a written agreement entered into between both parties before entering on the land as to what the teacher should be paid for growing crops or improvements in case of dismissal?—Yes.

21952 Something like the tenant right question?—Unquestionably, if the land is under crop the teacher should have the benefit of it.

21953 Don't you think that the scale on which the teacher's remuneration should be calculated, should be all settled beforehand, and not left for settlement when the time comes for separation?—It would be better to have the whole thing settled beforehand. It would obviate all difficulties, and they would be more likely to put in peace.

21954 Mr. Waldron.—Would you think it desirable for the interests of the children that there should be a piece of land attached to the school?—A small portion of land would not interfere with the efficiency of the school one way or other. I know of instances where the teacher has been enabled to get a piece of land, and I think on the contrary that it gives him a stake in the place. He was anxious to manage the bit of farm at hours separate from school hours, and he found that he was as it were tied down to the place and took an interest in being popular, because he would not have the same advantage elsewhere.

21955 Do you think he might teach agriculture as a small way to the pupils?—I don't think he would be of much advantage in that way. I know instances

where farms were established by the Board, in connexion with ordinary schools, and they turned out a failure, they have dwindled away as if of no value.

21956. Were they managed in another way?—They were managed under the sanction of the Board, and the teachers paid something for them.

21957. As agricultural teachers?—Yes, as agricultural teachers.

21958. What I contemplate is having a piece of land attached to the dwellings of the teachers, and I want to know do you think it would be desirable if that were done that the children should be shown the process of agriculture?—It would be useful to them, but I think, generally speaking, that teachers, unless specially instructed on the subject, are not in any way in advance of the farmers of the country.

21959. It might be arranged through the Inspectors of the Board that the teachers should be compelled to adopt more improved systems of agriculture?—If the farms were provided for them, free of rent, something of that kind might be done. The children might get improved tastes and habits in the management of a little garden, and in keeping their cottages in better order. It might be useful, but I think for the general management of farms it would be of little use.

21960. Mr. Storer.—At what time do boys leave your school?—The boys generally throughout the country are from ten to thirteen for literary education.

21961. At what age do they quit school?—There is scarcely any standard for it. They leave generally at very early ages, unless in some instances where the people see in better circumstances.

21962. Can you say what proportion of boys in school are over thirteen years of age?—At some seasons we have a considerable number in attendance—say in the winter time, over thirteen years of age—but in the spring and autumn, and throughout the summer season, there are scarcely one in twenty over thirteen years of age.

21963. Do you not find, as a matter of experience, that in order to make useful, skilful labourers, boys must take to practical work at an early age?—I think as a rule they are obliged to work quite too soon at present in our part of the country. I think the poverty of the people makes them put their children to hard work too soon, and it proves injurious to them in afterlife.

21964. Is it your opinion that the boys leave school too early in your district?—Precisely, and put to hard work too early and too young. From the time they are able to do anything whatever they are put to hard work in some shape. The older branches are employed on the farms, if they have any, or are kept leading cattle in the fields; and I have seen them employed under ten years at particular periods of the year. These children generally return to the school at the winter season.

21965. What mischief do you find resulting from persons quitting school early and taking to labour?—I think, as we term it in the country, the bone and marrow of the boy is tender, and when he is put to very hard work it stunts him in his growth, and it affects his constitution in afterlife.

21966. Short of that cruelty?—It is not exactly cruelty, but generally speaking, the boys are hired out, and a great many are so hired or sent out very young, both girls and boys. They are hired in the fields with farmers, and are subject to great cold. They are badly clothed—they have to undergo great cold and fatigue, and many contract diseases which run them in afterlife.

21967. Have you ever heard it said that Irish labour is the worst paid and yet the dearest in Europe?—Yes, I have heard it.

21968. Have you heard that state of things attributed to the late period at which boys quit school, and take to work?—I never heard that. From my experience I think they are put to work too early.

21969. Lord Chesham.—You being an advocate for education, and not for taking children too young from school, and put to work, should you be an advo-

cate to insist on them going to school?—I don't think the compulsory system in that way would work well at all. I believe, if you made it compulsory for a great number of the people to send their children to school, you would have to clothe them, and feed them up to a certain age, to the age that they are compelled to attend school in some other countries. The government would have to feed them, and clothe them to boot.

21970. You mentioned that in one of your schools you had a considerable number, or some number of Protestants?—I could not say the number. I think there was about a fourth of the whole number.

21971. How many are there in the whole school?—I suppose the average for the year would be about forty—at some periods more, and some less. Our schools in the country fluctuate much as to their attendance. I know one school, and at two periods in the year the average would be from twenty to thirty, and at another season of the year, it would reach from seventy to ninety. It fluctuates so much.

21972. You stated that a Roman Catholic teacher was teaching a Protestant minority with the Protestant version of the Bible, and so on?—Yes.

21973. And that he ceased doing that from thinking that it would not be pleasing to you. By his withdrawing that teaching did the children go away?—I believe not in that instance. He has never told me it was the case, and I did not make special inquiries on the subject.

21974. Was there a Protestant clergyman in that neighbourhood?—Not immediately in the neighbourhood.

21975. I presume there was in the parish?—Yes.

21976. Was his residence a long way from the school?—Almost three miles. It was situated at the very outskirts of the parish. It was partly attended by the children of my parish, and partly by the children of the adjoining parish.

21977. It was non-vested?—No, a vested school.

21978. Did the Protestant clergyman ever attend at the school to give his parishioners religious instruction?—Not to my knowledge.

21979. He might have done so, if he pleased, under the rules of the Board?—Certainly. The rules of the Board require that he should have an opportunity of doing so.

21980. You say you greatly prefer the denominational system?—I think that would be the general feeling, to have at least a system that a person establishing a school would be free to introduce books of his own selection, and choose the carrying out the religious instruction to his own satisfaction.

21981. In one question you told us you thought there would be no difficulty in providing a sort of conscience clause for nonconformists, where they are to be found?—I think it would be desirable if there was a conscience clause—but I cannot speak positively of the working of the conscience clause in England, not having resided there—but, I believe, it gives general satisfaction. I have seen a reference to it in a work that was published last year. I have not been in the schools in England.

21982. I am talking of the protection. You think there would be no difficulty in leaving protection for children?—I think not. If there was such a clause and strictly enforced.

21983. In answer to another question you told us that a tone of religion should go through the whole of education, and that a religious tone was infused from the teaching, almost imperceptibly, as in the case of Abraham and the altar?—Yes, I said so.

21984. I want to know exactly how you would propose to separate secular from religious education, that the religious minority would be protected?—Well, of course, I said there would be difficulties, and there will be always difficulties in that country, where one creed will be against and others numerous; but I think the difficulties might be lessened, and the majority would be able to train the children according to their satisfaction, and according to the principles of their creed, and I don't think the minority would be interfered

Dec. 4, 1868.  
The Rev.  
John  
McDonnell,  
&c.

Dec. 4, 1885  
The Rev.  
John  
McMenamin,  
&c.

with. They could be put away at the time of religious instruction. So far as my schools are concerned, I would be unwilling that teachers or others should attempt to tamper with the religion of any child. I would give an instance of what I did in a non-vested school. The teacher was a Catholic, and the parents of some children asked the mistress of the school to teach them in the Protestant Catechism, and the Protestant version of the Bible. She had a religious difficulty or scruple in doing so, and she consulted me. I directed the parents of those children to select a more advanced pupil of their own creed, and I would afford them time in the school, or at short hours after the ordinary school hours, that the Catechism could be taught by such pupil, but not by the teacher, because I thought if she took the Catechism into her own hand, and began to teach it, it afforded her or any teacher an opportunity of putting a construction on it that might not be in accordance with the real teaching the child should get according to its creed. I would not tolerate, so far as I knew, any low interference of that kind, or any tampering with the children. I would think it a wrong thing.

22085. There would be a difficulty from having a child imbued with the moral and religious tone of the instructor?—It is impossible, under all circumstances, to shut out all danger.

22086. Mr. Gilmore.—I believe there are two Presbyterian places of worship in Slievequin?—There are.

22087. It is rather a Presbyterian district?—It is just what we call a mixed locality. There are a good many Presbyterians in one portion of the parish. There are scarcely any in the other portion. The lower portion coming into the good land of the parish, is very much Presbyterian. But the mountain district is chiefly Catholic.

22088. I think you and the Presbyterians were rather shrewd of mind the Board?—No, I think they are rather shrewd towards the Board. They are establishing schools, under their own management, in connexion with the Board, and making the system more separate. It is separating one denomination from another still more. That is what I meant to convey. I don't know whether I conveyed it accurately or not.

22089. In your own parish I find there are six schools; they are all under Roman Catholic management?—They are all under my management.

22090. And the only National schools in the parish?—Yes.

22091. In that parish, therefore, although there are two Presbyterian places of worship, there are no schools under Presbyterian management?—Yes, in that particular parish; but I could mention other parishes in which they lately built several schools.

22092. You know the town of Letterkenny very well?—I do.

22093. Has there not been very lately an infant school opened there under the immediate patronage of the bishop?—Yes, there has been.

22094. Now, where did the children attending that school go before the school was opened?—A great many of them, I think, were attending at school at all.

22095. Well, others of them?—Others were attending the ordinary National school in the town, for there still is a female National school in the town beside it. Some of these attended what we call the poor school at the convent, and which has been given up.

22096. How many Presbyterian places of worship are there in Letterkenny?—There are two.

22097. What school is the oldest established in the town of Letterkenny? The oldest school in the town?—Well, I really cannot answer you. The oldest National school is the one that is under the management and control of the bishop. It was built in the year 1834, at least it was opened in connexion with the Board in 1834; it is the oldest National school in connexion with the Board in Letterkenny.

22098. I see in Letterkenny that there is a male National school and a female National school?—Yes, these are the schools I am referring to.

22099. Vested in the Roman Catholic?—Yes, there is one, No. 2, vested in the Presbyterian patron, and then there is the workhouse school in connexion with the Board.

22100. There would appear, therefore, to be actually three?—Yes, but the workhouse school is not open to the public.

22101. Not including one lately opened by the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese?—These are the only three schools in connexion with the Board. There is another school not connected with the Board.

22102. I am only speaking of those in connexion with the Board?—Yes, there are three in connexion with the Board.

22103. Well now, how long is it since these schools were opened near the convent?—In the year 1834, about thirty-four years ago.

22104. Where is Rev. Oliver Leech's school that you say has been lately opened?—It is on Mr. Fratt's property. I cannot tell you the name of the place at present. It is Carnavadilly, or somewhere on the road to it. I think it is called Cullion, or some embodiment of that kind. It is near a place called Carrigahilly, between Letterkenny and Carnavadilly.

22105. Letterkenny is a district where the Presbyterian population is pretty numerous?—Yes, they are pretty numerous indeed.

22106. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is this school yet opened which has been begun by Mr. Leech?—No it is not opened yet. It is, I think, only in progress of building. 22107. You say it is being built out from Letterkenny. How far from Letterkenny?—Something, I think, about a mile.

22108. How far from any other National school?—About a mile and a half in the opposite direction.

22109. Is there a fair Presbyterian population in that district?—Well, it is mixed.

22110. A mixed population?—About half and half.

22111. Are you in favour of the National system, or not?—I do not approve of the present system, and I think I said that very early.

22112. In your own neighbourhood at present there are no schools under the National Board with Protestant managers?—Not in my parish.

22113. Now, you were previously a parish clergyman, I understand, at Carrigahilly?—I was, sir.

22114. Were the schools in the neighbourhood mixed schools?—No, there was very little admixture in the National schools there.

22115. Under whose management were the National schools at Carrigahilly?—There were certain schools under my management when I was there, and some of them under the management of Presbyterian clergymen, and some of them under the management of Protestant clergymen.

22116. Could you mention how many schools were under the management of Roman Catholic clergymen?—I think seven were under my management when there.

22117. How many were under the management of the Episcopalian or Established Church clergymen?—Two.

22118. Could you name them?—There is one at Raphoe.

22119. But I am speaking of Carrigahilly, which is in a different parish from Raphoe?—I think there is only one there.

22120. Is there one at all?—There is.

22121. What is its name?—The Rev. Mr. Martin—and the name of the school?—It is on the road between Carrigahilly and the mountain, and is called Aughy gale National school.

22122. Did any Roman Catholic children attend?—Scarcely any, because there was a school of some sort at the chapel, about half a mile from it.

22123. Now, you say there were seven schools in the parish under Roman Catholic management. How many under Presbyterian management?—In the parish of Carrigahilly.

22124. Yes?—I think two.

22125. Name them?—One in the town of Carrigahilly, and another in a place called Carrigahilly. I think Carrigahilly is in the parish of Carrigahilly.



22024. Are you sure it is in the parish of Convey? I believe it is. I am in a difficulty about the boundary, because both parishes were united under my administration, and the union of parishes went under the name of Raphoe.

22025. Mr. Sadleir.—Are you speaking of the ecclesiastical parishes or the legal ones, or the unions over which the parishes are placed?—I have tried to answer so far as I can as to what is called the legal division, but I am not perfectly satisfied as to the legal division of that school of Cornaleway; but I think it is in the legal parish of Convey.

22026. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Then the latest returns from the National Board state that there is not one school in the parish under a Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Mr. Wray having some time ago died?—He must be a long time dead. He was dead long before I went to the parish. The gentlemen there now, for time or ten years, is the Rev. Mr. Beatty, and there are two schools in the parish.

22027. Do you acknowledge his school as furnishing a fair sample of mixed education?—There were at times a considerable number of Catholic children attending it, but they have left it by degrees when other schools were provided for them.

22028. Are we to understand that the Presbyterians were not the only persons who provided schools simply to meet the necessities of the case?—Certainly; I have no conception about that. The parish generally adopted it in that part of the country. We were the first, generally speaking, I don't say it was exactly to meet the necessities of the case, but the convenience of the people.

22029. Mr. Stokes.—Is there not this difference, that Catholics do not profess to approve of mixed education, and Presbyterians do profess to approve of it?—Yes, of course, they do; and I only instance the case because between their public and private conduct there appears an inconsistency.

22030. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are there many Presbyterians in the parish with which you are connected?—There are a good number.

22031. What should you say as to their relative proportion to the other denominations?—I have no statistics that I could refer to with any degree of accuracy. The parish of Stanzel is something like the parish of Convey. I am not sure whether in the legal division there are the parishes of Stranish and Killyneck. But in the parish that is under my charge, I would say about one-third, perhaps, are Presbyterians. I do not think it is more.

22032. Could you give us the proportions in the district in which you were previously located?—That is in the parish of Convey.

22033. Yes, and Raphoe?—They would be somewhere about the same proportion—between one-third and one-fourth.

22034. Could you say in all these districts how many schools there were under Roman Catholic management?—In each district.

22035. Yes, in each district?—I think there were seven under Roman Catholic management.

22036. How many?—I should say seven, taking the parishes of Raphoe and Convey together. I have stated in my last parish there were seven schools under my patronage in the united parishes of Raphoe and Convey.

22037. And how many under Presbyterians?—In the two parishes?—I think five.

22038. Could you name the five?—There was one at Ballyhooley, another in Raphoe town, another at Cornaleway, another at Convey, another established about two years ago at a place called Glenmiquin.

22039. You are referring to the two parishes?—Yes, and when I mention that there were seven schools in my parish, then I, of course, include all the schools in the two parishes, or in the union.

22040. With regard to Presbyterians establishing schools under their own management, and having regard to the mention of Ballyhooley, may I ask is that a school lately established under Presbyterian

management?—No, it was established a great many years ago.

22041. Could you say how many?—I suppose over twenty years ago. It was not always open as a school.

22042. Should you be surprised to find it was upwards of thirty years ago?—I should not. I was not living there when it was opened, and I have no dates to direct me. I said I thought it was upwards of twenty years.

22043. With regard to Letterkeney, what is the proportion of Presbyterians in Letterkeney, in the districts with which you are familiar?—The parish in which I officiated took in parts of two parishes, and did not embrace the entire parish. It was a sort of district attached to the Roman Catholic chapel, the mountain district was under another clergyman.

22044. But take Letterkeney in a district by itself, ministered to by Roman Catholic clergymen, what is the proportion of Presbyterians?—It might be something like one-third, taking the district in which I officiated.

22045. You have already stated that in the town of Letterkeney there are two Presbyterian ministers?—Yes, sir.

22046. What is the proportion of the Presbyterian population in the town of Letterkeney?—In the town itself.

22047. Yes?—I could not just tell exactly now. It is only a random guess. Something about one-third in the town, as well as in the whole district. Scarcely one-third. I do not think it is one-third.

22048. How many schools are in Letterkeney under Presbyterian management?—Only one, I think, in the town; I am not sure. I will not say whether there is a male and female school, or a mixed school. I never was in the school, and I cannot say as to whether the males and females are taught separately or not.

22049. With regard to Stranish, will you give me the same particulars?—About one-third. I do not think they amount to one-third. Perhaps of Episcopalian and Presbyterians there would not be more than one-third of all.

22050. How many schools are in Stranish under Roman Catholic management?—In the entire parish?

22051. Yes?—Six.

22052. How many under Presbyterian management?—None in connexion with the Board.

22053. Under those circumstances should you think it a very unreasonable thing, considering that the National system is administered so largely denominationally, that a Presbyterian minister should ask to have the management of a school?—Certainly not. I have no objection at all to it. I do not complain of that at all.

22054. Are the schools under Roman Catholic management, with which you are familiar, fairly mixed?—No, there is scarcely any mixture at all, except in the school—Dovey school—to which I before referred.

22055. Are you referring to your present parish?—Yes.

22056. Could you give me the particulars as to the religious denominations of the schools in which you are manager?—That is the exact number attending them?

22057. Yes?—I cannot give the exact number. All the schools are attended exclusively by Roman Catholics, except one, and that is the school of Dovey.

22058. Now, I find by looking to the previous report of the Commissioners of National Education, to which I have referred, that these schools were all mixed races or less. If not mixed at present, where do the majority, formerly attending these schools, receive their education?—There are other private schools that I have referred to already. There are the Church Education schools. There are two schools in the parish supported by Sir Samuel Hayes by some kind of private grant—I do not know where it is derived from, and these schools are in operation in central districts.

22059. I suppose, then, on the day the Constable

Dec. 4/1855

The Rev.  
John  
McManis,  
P.P.

Dec. 4, 1898

The Rev.  
John  
M. Mooney,  
Esq.

lary visited your schools, in the month of June last, they found no mixed attendance of children?—They might have found one or two, but they were very few, if any at all. I have never found the scholars of other denominations attending any of the schools but one.

22062. Mr. Sullivan.—Does your observation apply to Stranorlar or to Conroy only?—I am speaking of the present parish where I am—Stranorlar.

22063. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You said a certain Presbyterian teacher in a school, where the majority of the children were Roman Catholic, gave a certain interpretation of the word "altar"—was he asked by the Inspector to give an interpretation?—As I understood from the Inspector, he merely wished to see his system of teaching, and asked him to teach a class in his presence. I don't think the Inspector asked him anything, but stood by and let him teach as he thought fit.

22064. Did the Inspector object to the interpretation given?—I do not know, but he merely mentioned the fact in conversation, and afterwards in a letter to me.

22065. Would you be so kind as to name the Inspector?—If it is necessary I will, but I would rather not. I will tell you the school, if you like. It is called Drumful. I cannot tell you the locality in which it is, whether in the Lagan district near Derry, or in western part of the county.

22066. Then it is not in your district?—No.

22067. It is a matter which you simply heard?—Yes; I told you I had heard it, but I cannot doubt my authority.

22068. What religion was the Inspector?—He was a Catholic.

22069. Do you know what year it occurred in?—Within the last five or six years.

22070. Do you know the name of the teacher?—I do not know the name of the teacher, but the name of the school was Drumful.

22071. Now, you have said that the Presbyterian ministers have been denouncing the bishops for their advocacy of denominational education?—Well, I think they did.

22072. May I ask you what you mean by denunciations of the bishops?—Oh, condemning their policy for being adverse to what they consider to be the interests of education. I speak in reference to those language at their public meetings in Belfast—some of the public meetings of their Assembly, as they call it.

22073. Do we understand you to say they indulged in the use of any violent language, or personal remarks of the bishops?—Well, they spoke in a way certainly not very respectful of them.

22074. Could you give me the words?—I could not repeat the words at the present time, but the tendency of them was designating them what they called Ultra-montanes, and other changes of that kind, as well as I remember. I could not refer to the speeches in particular.

22075. Do you regard that as denunciation of the bishops?—Well, I think in the acceptance of the word at the present time it is somewhat contemptuous.

22076. Do not many of the Roman Catholics themselves indulge in that term towards the policy of the bishops?—I think some of them do, but do not generally attach the same meaning to the word.

22077. When Presbyterians use a word adopted publicly, used by Catholics themselves, they can scarcely be said to denounce the bishops?—It depends very much on the context in which it is used, and the circumstances in which it is used. The same word may be offensive at one time, and in other circumstances it would not be offensive at all. All depends on the meaning attached to a word, and the known intention of the person using it.

22078. You have referred to denunciations in Belfast, when did those denunciations begin?—I cannot tell exactly, but the speeches to which I refer, have been delivered within the last five or six years.

22079. Now you have traced a connection between

the denunciations of the bishops and the Presbyterians getting up schools in your district "as fast as they can." Will you mention the number and names of the schools got up since?—There was one got up by Mr. Leach near Letterkenney, another in a place called Glentiesquin, in the parish of Rathoe. It is under the patronage and management of the Rev. Mr. Morris, of Masseraveenagh.

22080. Any other?—Well, I cannot name any others at the present time.

22081. In this connection may I ask you what other National schools are at Glentiesquin?—There is one National school under Catholic management with less than half a mile of this school on one side of it, and another National school somewhat about three quarters of a mile on the other side under our management—under Catholic management.

22082. Is it largely attended?—The attendance was never large in either school.

22083. And at what time was this school at Glentiesquin got up?—About two years ago. It is scarcely two years since it was opened.

22084. But you say that irrespective of the connection you have been tracing between the denunciations and the establishment of these schools the necessities of Letterkenney do not warrant a new school?—Well, I think there may be some roominess for a new school, perhaps, in Letterkenney district, that is nearly a mile or about a mile from Letterkenney, but in the Glentiesquin district no such reason could be assigned, because there were two schools within an Irish mile of each other before, and it is now placed between them.

22085. You have said already that the Presbyterians were getting up such schools in consequence or in connection with their denunciations "as fast as they can"—do you regard the answer which you now give as proof of as fast as they can?—If I remember I said wherever they could, if I said the words in that sense, I said them inadvertently.

22086. Then you render it, whenever they could?—Yes.

22087. But you say that in the large districts in which you have referred, if they had chosen they could have got up a larger number of schools?—They might have had more schools for that district earlier than they had, but now it is difficult to get them up, because others have been erected under other management.

22088. Are you not aware that the first schools under the National education system were in that part?—I am not aware in any district.

22089. Are you not aware that Ballyhooley was one of the first?—Yes.

22090. And that the present one in Rathoe was one of the first?—Yes; there was one good school established in Rathoe.

22091. So early as 1832?—I cannot tell.

22092. Now, may I ask you if you ever heard the Roman Catholics reply, or any of them, themselves express dissatisfaction with the demands of the bishops?—No, not in any part of the country, I never did.

22093. Do you know of any cases in which the Presbyterian managers employed Roman Catholic teachers?—No, I do not.

22094. Or in which the Roman Catholic managers employed Protestant teachers?—No, I cannot name any at the present time; the idea did not occur to me, and I do not know on a balance of it.

22095. May I ask are you satisfied with the books of the National Board of Education?—I am not.

22096. Then should you propose that the books of the National system, or system of education of which you would approve, should be more pronounced than at present with Catholic doctrine?—I think there should be pronouncement in schools exclusively Catholic to use Catholic books more freely.

22097. And would you make an exception in other places?—I would be more careful there, certainly.

22098. How could you be more careful, unless you had a different system of education, should you pro-

\* See Appendix, No. XV., for letters from Presbyterian clergymen with reference to Presbyterian schools in Donegal.

pose, under any circumstances, a different system of education for one set of schools from another?—I think there should be permission given for the introduction of books exclusively Catholic for the use of Catholics.

22109. What do you mean by exclusively Catholic?—That is where there are attending but Catholics; the rule is as rigid in its application where a Protestant of any religious denomination never enters as where they are mixed. In our convent schools the application of the rule is as rigid as in any other place or school.

22110. Your district is largely Roman Catholic, with a small Episcopalian population?—Yes.

22111. Are there many parishes in your county of Donegal in which the children of Episcopallians of the poorer classes who attend National schools are, of necessity, very small?—There are a good many parishes where they are very small.

22112. Where not more than half a dozen could attend a school at a convenient distance?—I suppose there are some places, in some parts of the diocese, that I am not fully acquainted with, where that may be the case.

22113. What provision would you make for children of the Established Church so circumstanced?—I think if they have to attend in these schools, when anything exclusively Catholic, or connected with Catholic teaching, is introduced they should be at full liberty to go away, or there should be a clause obliging the teacher to remove them or send them away.

22114. But, provided you have education permitted largely with Catholic doctrine, how could they possibly be protected?—Let these books be read at different times, and let the parents of the children have the right to object to their children being asked to read any books to which they have an objection.

22115. Do you propose to relegate such books to times for religious instruction?—It might be done so where the schools must be of mixed attendance.

22116. In all cases where Protestants attend a school, would you confine your books to the National Board books?—I should like that the National Board books would be more historical in their character, and give the boys and girls some more knowledge of the world about them, and of their own country. They are very limited at present as to the knowledge they impart.

22117. I wish you to keep in view the provisions you would make for small Protestant minorities attending your school. What books would you substitute for the present books if you had the master in your own hands?—I would not take that upon me. I have not gone so much into the nature of the case as to suggest any books published, but there would be a difficulty connected with it in the instance to which you refer.

22118. And what provision would you make for such a case?—I speak chiefly in reference to cases where, practically, the schools are of one entire class or creed, and so other. I say the rule is as rigid in its application as anywhere else.

22119. Have you not acknowledged that your district is a fairly mixed district?—Yes, but not the schools.

22120. And in such a case would you propose to set up the entire district into denominational schools—Roman Catholic, Established Church, and Presbyterian?—They are practically so already. There is only one instance where there is anything like a fair admixture at the present time in the schools.

22121. You adhere to that opinion, after having given us already an account of the small number of schools under Presbyterian management?—I think the number of schools under Presbyterian management is decreasing, and that the system is denominational in principle.

22122. But I refer to all the districts with which you have been familiar as a clergyman, where you have been doing duty?—I think they are generally so. I think, as a general rule, they are so.

22123. You object to the books, that they do not contain anything calculated to give Roman Catholic children an idea of the Catholic world—that they do not teach Catholicity or the history of the Church, or

faith, as fully as they ought. Did I understand you to say that the Government was the party who had undertaken to educate the people?—I suppose that the Government have undertaken to educate them through the National system.

22124. Do you think it is the duty of the Government to teach Catholicity to the children in the National schools?—That is another question altogether.

22125. But will you answer it, please?—The first one is a practical one, which they actually do, and it would be a different question, of course, what would be their duty.

22126. But it is one of your objections to the system and I wish to know your opinion of the duty of Government?—I do not object to the system because it does not teach it, but I object to it because it is not even permissive and excludes it.

22127. Do you not object to the books because they do not contain the information that you want?—And because no other books will be allowed except books of that stamp. It is not permitted to introduce other books.

22128. Will you answer the question whether it is the duty of the Government to introduce such books?—That might lead to a great deal of discussion, and I do not know what practical good might result if we discussed the question.

22129. We shall not discuss it here. I will receive a short answer to the question?—I rather think it is not the duty of the Government to provide religious instruction in that way, but Government should not prevent others from supplying the deficiency.

22130. Are the Protestants to have the books interwoven with Protestant doctrine?—Of course, if they desire it.

22131. Do you regard the Catholic children as wholly deprived of every opportunity of becoming acquainted with Catholicity?—So far as the system is concerned it has that tendency certainly.

22132. But I presume that Roman Catholic clergymen and other intelligent persons in connexion with their Church, devote a great deal of their time to give instruction in that way?—We must do it.

22133. Is there anything to hinder them linking the people with a spirit of Catholicity from the pulpit?—A great deal of difficulty from the poverty of the people, and the necessity they are under to engage in the service of others, and the difficulty of getting them together on Sundays. Very often the children of the poor people are kept herding cattle on Sundays as well as on other days, and it is difficult to get them together for the purpose of instruction. Many of them are hired with Protestants and Catholics, and of course they are kept at the duties of their particular avocations very often on Sundays.

22134. Do not the same duties hinder them receiving literary instruction in schools?—They are capable of receiving a certain amount of literary instruction, whilst they would not be able, in a short time to receive and acquire sufficient religious instruction.

22135. Are not your teachers all Roman Catholics?—They are.

22136. And the managers of your schools largely Roman Catholic?—They are.

22137. What is to prevent the managers and the teachers from giving religious instruction to the children at their schools?—We try to do that as far as we can.

22138. You regard the Church, I presume, as bound to look after her own children?—Yes.

22139. And as such you teach your children their catechism from their youth?—Yes.

22140. Do you believe it is not a fact that they are as well taught in Roman Catholic doctrine as Protestant children are in Protestant doctrine?—Well, I could form no comparison. I never had an opportunity of inquiring into the religious education of the Protestant children attending schools in my neighbourhood. I cannot speak at all about the relative proficiency of one to the other.

22141. Do you regard it as of great importance that the Roman Catholic should be acquainted with the history of the Church?—Yes.

Dec. 4, 1868.  
—  
The Rev.  
John  
McManis,  
P.P.

Dec. 4, 1885.

The Rev  
John  
H. McMenamin,  
P.P.

22133 And learn what is going on in the Roman Catholic world at all times?—To a certain extent they should know all about it.

22133 Do you not think it would be dangerous to keep them apprised of the doings of the Catholic world just now?—I think not. I think it would be much safer for them to learn the doings of the Catholic world from calm, well-digested history, than learn them from partisan newspapers, and other sources, as they will be sure to do.

22134 Do you not believe that the main duty of the State, representing all parties and denominations, is to aid in teaching the children the three leading branches of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and at the same time to secure for the discharge of their duty?—Oh! that is certainly a duty—a very important duty; but I think it is equally an important duty to have the children brought up practically good Christians in whatever creed they may belong to, and it is difficult under the National system to bring up Catholics practically in the duties of their religion.

22135 Now, do you regard that as the duty of the State or the duty of the Church to bring up children in the creed to which they belong?—Oh! I think it is the duty of the Church. I answered that before. But I think the State should afford facilities in the discharge of that duty.

22136 Mr. McMenamin.—How many Catholic churches are in your present parish?—Only one.

22137 How many schools?—There are six National schools under my management.

22138 What is the greatest distance anyone has to go to the church?—There are a few families in my parish that have to go six miles.

22139 Have many of them to go four?—A good many of them have to go from four to three.

22140 With regard to the schools themselves, what is the greatest distance anyone in your parish has to send children to any school?—Some have to send them two and a half miles or two miles, but these are the people who live at one end of the parish, detached from the rest of the parish, in a mountain district, and there never could be a sufficient number brought to form a school if they were not brought together in one place.

22141 As a general rule what is the distance?—About a mile or a mile and a half.

22142 If you were to give all your religious instruction to the younger children in the church would you get children from the whole of your parish to the church on Sunday?—Certainly not. It would be a total impossibility for many reasons; first, from their poverty and nakedness; and secondly, because they are employed upon the Sunday often in the service of others.

22143 Is it not desirable therefore that instruction should be given by some one in the different schools scattered over the parish?—Yes, and we have religious instruction given to them after hours; but that is not sufficient in my opinion.

22144 Is not the proper age for giving elementary instruction in religion the same age as that which is best adapted for secular instruction?—It is, so far as improving it upon the memory.

22145 Is not that very important?—That is important, but there is a great deal more than merely impressing it on the memory to make it valuable for the children.

22146 Is not the proper time for giving religious instruction when they are at school?—Yes, that is the proper time; at least it should coincide with that age.

22147 How many of your schools are vested?—Only two.

22148 And the others are non-vested?—Yes.

22149 The State allows religious instruction to be given in the vested schools, and you are at liberty to give it in the schools that are built at your own expense?—Yes.

22150 Does the State in giving that permission undertake to teach the Catholic religion or the Protestant religion by allowing a school-room to be used for reli-

gious instruction?—Well, it affords the opportunities, but it does not provide for the instruction, or make it in any sense imperative.

22151 Is it not one of the rules of the Board that facilities should be given for instruction?—Yes, that is the rule of the Board, but it must be voluntary on the part of the children to receive it, and the services of the religious instructor must be gratuitous.

22152 In giving permission to use the school that religious instruction should be given at some time, does that not imply that the books also should be used?—The books are provided at the expense of the school. They are—they are provided at the expense of the children.

22153 Then, if the patron of the school had the right of selecting his books, to employ in the case of a Catholic school Catholic books, would the State have anything to do with the matter one way or the other?—The State be under the duty of providing Catholic religion for Catholic pupils when the patron pays for his own books?—Certainly not. I think not.

22154 That is, in the ordinary religious instruction?—Yes. The difference between the book case and the case of religious instruction is that the Board strictly requires that an opportunity will be given in one case for religious instruction to the children of any denomination who may ask for it. And in reference to books, they strictly prohibit any books but those which they choose themselves, and they will give no permission for any books beyond them.

22155 What I want to get out chiefly is this—if the rule were altered with regard to these books, and if the books became in certain cases Catholic and in other cases Presbyterian or Protestant, the State would not thereby undertake to teach any religion?—It would not, as under the present rule in reference to religious instruction the State requires that permission be given and facilities afforded for that purpose; but that does not imply that the State undertakes to teach religion, neither would it undertake to teach it in permitting the requisite books for that purpose.

22156 Are there any convent schools in your present parish?—None, none in the diocese but two—one at Ballykannon and the other in Letterkenny, and the one in Letterkenny has no school in connexion with the Board.

22157 When you were at Letterkenny was there a school in connexion with the convent?—The nuns were appointed teachers in the school at Letterkenny, but the Board would not permit them. They continued to teach for twelve months, but got no salary.

22158 What order of nuns are they?—The same as those at Rathfriland—the Loretto order.

22159 Their duty is to teach the high classes?—Yes.

22160 And they have a school of that kind?—Yes.

22161 And where was the convent from which the nuns came who taught?—About 100 yards away, and the school is situated on their own ground.

22162 On what ground did the Board refuse to allow this salary?—When I was appointed to the parish of Letterkenny I found that the nuns had been recently introduced there a short time before I was appointed, and I found that for the first and second quarter there was no payment coming, as was to the other schools in the district, and I wrote to know the reason, and the reason assigned by the Board was that "they could not be recognised or admitted as teachers in vested schools."

22163 Oh, that very school was a vested school?—It was, and it appeared to be a very satisfactory answer, for, on looking over the published reports of the Commissioners for the previous year, I found fifty-two vested schools with nuns actually teaching in them, and receiving salary. Well, they stated they could not do it; they could not pay salaries to nuns in vested schools; and when I discovered this in the public report I wrote to the Board to ask me I correct in my inference as to the number of schools actually taught by nuns receiving salaries, and if so, how they could reconcile it with the answer previously given.

22164 What answer did you receive?—They an-

swore that my inference from the public report was true, but that they had come to affirm the rule some years previously, and that from that period forward they would not admit nuns into vested schools.

22163. How is that school vested—in trustees or in the Board?—In local trustees.

22164. Did the trustees propose to buy up the Board's interest in the matter?—It was very peculiarly circumstanced. The only trustees named in the deed of trust were dead, and no trustees had been ever appointed to succeed them since.

22165. In what position is the Board now as regards that school?—They still claim the right over the school, and the control over it, and it is still in connection with the Board.

22166. And how is it that no successors to the original trustees were appointed?—Well, I do not know. The local parties took no interest in it, and the Board was negligent, or overlooked it, and no trustees were appointed.

22167. Since then have you made no attempt to get up a convent school in the town?—There was an attempt made at one time, but the convent was very small, and could only accommodate a small number, and it did not succeed well, and was given up. They have got up a school for boarders, and a middle-class school for day children, and the rest of the children are attending the National school conducted by a secular teacher since the nuns were turned out of it.

22170. If you were to build a school alongside the present one, out of your own funds, and the nuns of the convent were to teach, the money would be paid for teaching in that case?—I presume it would, the rules of the Board would entitle them to payment.

22171. The sole reason for making the exception was, that it was a school once vested in local trustees?—That was the objection made, but I thought it was a very unfair objection made by the Board, and I believe it would scarcely be a legal ground for their refusing if it had been well tried, at least I was told so by a distinguished lawyer whom I consulted on the subject. The school was built in 1854, and at the earlier stages in all instances, where a grant was made to build a school, a printed form of the rules was sent down with the grant-check, and one of the questions to be answered by the applicant was would he conform to the rules of the Board, and a printed copy of the rules was sent to him, and he should distinctly answer that he did, or the application would fail, and I think in the earlier stages every single person applying for a grant believed he was only binding himself to the rules then sent him, and to no others.

22172. In fact, you believed you were only bound by the covenants of the lease?—Yes, or rather, I should say, by the covenants and agreements entered into antecedent to the execution of the lease. And it is a remarkable fact, that since I made my objection, and since I charged them with a breach of faith in the matter the Board has ceased to send the Form and Rules as before.

22173. In fact, any change made subsequently should not be binding?—I thought it should not be retrospective, and that there should be a distinct copy of the rules furnished, in order that the applicant might know to what he is to bind himself, and I considered it should bind both parties alike.

22174. Who pays the ground rent of that school?—There is no ground rent.

22175. On whose ground is it situated?—The late bishop was the proprietor of the ground. When the school was built he was the owner in fee-simple, and he had conveyed his right and interest in the property to the nuns at the time I am speaking of.

22176. And they of course would have had to eject the Board?—There might be expense and trouble and difficulty about the matter, and the nuns never undertook it, or any other person for them.

22177. If the nuns ejected them, and got possession of the school, it would become non-vested, and then would they not be entitled to receive aid from the

Board?—If they got the place into their own possession, and opened the school, they would be entitled to receive aid certainly.

22178. Do you not consider that an anomalous condition of the rules of the Board?—It appears to be so certainly. The lease was for thirty-one years or three lives. The lives are surviving. One was Her Majesty the Queen, the other was His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge. I do not recollect the name of the third party, but I believe it is the Marquess of Kildare. There were three lives I think in the lease.

22179. Is there any other point in relation to the conduct of the National Board towards nuns that you would wish to mention?—I think nuns are very unfairly paid by the Board, for example, for teaching from seventy-five to 100 children, of the regular average attendance, they would be paid only £20 a year, while ordinary lay teachers might be paid from £70 to £100 a year for teaching the same school with exactly the same number of pupils.

22180. Are not the lay teachers subjected to examination? Are they not paid also upon their personal qualifications?—Generally they are, at least the scale of payment depends less or more upon the examinations and proficiency.

22181. If you take the lowest scale of payment in which there is no examination required, and compare the payment in that case alone with the payment of the nuns, how would it be?—It would be about a third more than what the nuns would be paid.

22182. Do you mean in the case of the lowest paid teachers?—The lowest paid female teachers would get £14 a year if able to command an average of twenty to twenty-five children.

22183. In the case of a nun's school having only from twenty to twenty-five children, have you any idea of what amount they would get?—I think only £10.

22184. Then, between that and what you have just stated, there is not so much difference?—Of course not, but the increase of salary would not be in proportion to the numbers in attendance or the efficiency of the school.

22185. Must there not be a distinction of this kind always between very large schools in towns and small schools in rural and country districts, and in order to maintain schools in such districts, must not a certain sacrifice be made by the State?—Of course, but whether lay teachers be in the same town with nuns or not, they would be paid better, even for teaching a school equal in numbers.

22186. But in these not this element of classification entering into the question, would there be any objection, in your mind, to the principle of the nuns and religious orders making an examination, and claiming their salaries in the same way as lay teachers do?—I think the nuns would not like, as a rule, to be subject to an examination of that kind, at least except in their own convents. I know there are some orders of nuns who are not at liberty to leave their convents for any purposes unless under extraordinary circumstances, and by a special dispensation.

22187. Now that university examinations are carried out by peripatetic Commissioners, suppose the difficulty about leaving the convents was got over, and the examinations conducted by written papers in the convents themselves, would that obviate the difficulty in any way?—I don't suppose the nuns would object to that, at least they would not have the same amount of difficulty.

22188. Would not that greatly simplify the matter by getting rid of the whole question about religious orders, and putting all upon the one basis, so that the State should not have to inquire whether the teachers were nuns or not?—I think so. I think the question for the State would be simply to look to the work done, and how it was done.

22189. Is it not always desirable to have as few rules with regard to classification of persons who are to act as teachers as possible?—So far as that goes I think so.

Dec 4, 1884

The Rev John H. Newman, &amp;c.

Dec. 4, 1885.

The Rev.  
John  
McManis,  
&c.

22190. Suppose there was a Minister of Education, would he not be bound to carry out his rules irrespective of exceptional cases—rules that he would propose, for example, in the House of Commons, should he not make them equally applicable to all teachers, irrespective of their other functions in life?—I don't know what the duties of a Minister of Education would be, I think we have nothing of the kind in this country.

22191. I mention him as an example, but the question is the same, whoever the person may be who performs the functions of such an office. In Ireland it is the Chief Secretary who discharges the duty in the House of Commons. Would it not be desirable, as matter by whom the matter was being dealt with, that all differences between monks and nuns, and laypersons, with regard to the discharge of the duties of teachers under the State should be got rid of as far as possible?—I think so.

22192. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You said, I think, that the ladies in the case you mention had the school for twelve months?—Yes, or upwards.

22193. For the children of the poorer classes?—Yes.

22194. Did they give it up at the end of the twelve months?—Yes, the Board invited upon them being put out of it, and threatened law proceedings if they would not leave. They then retired.

22195. Did these ladies continue teaching the children of the poor?—No, they had no house to teach them in, and they were obliged to confine themselves to teaching children of the higher classes.

22196. Is the school still used for teaching under the National Board?—Yes, it is a double school—both male and female teachers. I would have tried the law in that case, from the advice I got, were it not that the male teacher occupied a portion of the house. He was for a long time the teacher, he was a most efficient man, and he got leave to retire shortly after, and received retiring compensation of £125. I saw that I could not control the case of the nuns without victimising him, and exposing him to the risk of losing his retiring allowance, which would be to him a grievance and an injustice, and I had to submit.

22197. If you had a good case now against the Commissioners should you be disposed to make it?—If I were in the position to have the Commissioners plaintiffs, I could defend the case at much less expense than if I were the plaintiff. I could have fought the battle at that time much more advantageously than now.

22198. Under whose management is the school now?—I don't know whether it is the bishop or his administrator who is returned as manager.

22199. How many teachers are there in the school?—A male and female teacher. It is a double house.

22200. Is the attendance large?—I cannot say now.

The male school was closed last year for some time from want of a teacher. I don't know how it is working.

22201. You have said that in vested schools the parties must conform to the rules. What was the rule of the Board on religious instruction in the case of vested schools?—The vesting rule now is, in the first instance, that Protestant children are not to be permitted to be present while the Catholic teacher is giving religious instruction, and vice versa.

22202. What are the facilities afforded to ministers of different denominations?—The rule is, that there must be an opportunity afforded for ministers or others where the children or parents or guardians will require it, that there must be an opportunity afforded at certain times for giving religious instruction in the school.

22203. Mr. Sullivan.—If the nuns were teaching would you have objected to carry out that rule?—Certainly not. I would have given the opportunity before or after school hours.

22204. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In a vested school?—Yes.

22205. In the case of a non-vested school, yourself being the manager, and ladies teaching under your management, should you extend the same privileges to ministers of other denominations?—If necessary I would. I was never asked for any permission of the kind. I never, therefore, had an opportunity of grant-

ing it or refusing it. If any clergyman asked me, and said he felt it necessary, or if any persons came and said "will you permit this, and we will take care that the school-furniture and books will be taken proper care of, and if injured will be repaired," I would have given an opportunity for it, even in a non-vested school.

22206. Would the bishops and clergy of your Church be disposed to act on that principle?—I don't know. I cannot say, practically, what they would be disposed to do, because I never knew an application to be made where a priest was a manager, in any of the schools I have ever been in such an application was never made to me.

22207. Did the same rule to which you have referred in the case of vested schools, of the ministers of all denominations having facilities to give religious instruction, apply to vested schools from the beginning?—I cannot answer you very positively on that. I know it does since the year 1850, the date at which I first became a manager of schools.

22208. Mr. Sullivan.—In any case where a number of Protestants of any denomination attended a school under the management of a priest, in your part of the country, have you reason to believe that if they wanted facilities for religious instruction they would be refused them, even in non-vested schools?—I think under ordinary circumstances, they would not be refused. They would not be refused unless there was some apprehension that it would give rise to bad feeling, unless in fact there was some special ground for a refusal, but I never discussed the matter with any priest. I cannot say positively what they might do, but my opinion is they would not unduly refuse.

22209. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Referring to what you regard as the unfair payment to the nuns for teaching, are you aware that the ladies themselves are not engaged in teaching for more than a short time each day?—I am not, on the contrary, I think they teach as long in their schools in connexion with the Board as any other teachers I know. There are some instances where they employ teachers and pay them, but they have to pay these secular teachers out of their own funds.

22210. Should you be surprised if you heard, on the authority of Catholic as well as Protestant inspectors, that the nuns do not teach in many cases more than a few hours a day?—That may be. If they get their work efficiently done by lay teachers approved of by the Board, that would be an additional reason why they ought to be paid as the teachers of any other school.

22211. Are not these ladies paid by capitation grant?—Yes, but it is very meagrely.

22212. In addition, are these other payments made to their schools?—Not that I am aware.

22213. Are you not aware they have all the advantage of first class monitors under the Board?—Of course, but any payment made on their account, is made directly to the monitor, as in all other schools.

22214. Do they receive the highest rate of payment?—I think only on the same scale as in any other school.

22215. Are you not aware that these first class monitors receive a much higher rate of pay?—They receive a higher rate of pay than other monitors, but not higher in amount than in other schools.

22216. Of 140 first class monitors under the Board receiving this high class pay, are you not aware the convents enjoy considerably more than half?—Some may or may not, but the same monitors would get the same payment in any other school.

22217. Mr. Sullivan.—Is it not the case that the convents have been efficient in bringing out such monitors?—I believe so. If I recollect rightly, in the reports of Commissioners some years ago, it was stated that the convent schools, as a class, were the most efficient schools in Ireland.

22218. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it not the fact that it was the very large rather than efficient schools that obtained the appointment of first class monitors?—It is a proof of the efficiency of the schools.

23219. Are you not aware these convent schools receive large sums for cleanliness, order, for music, drawing, and work, over and above the stipendium grant, and the payments to first class nuns?—They don't receive one penny more than is paid to any other school under my teachers, where the same claims can be established; and I do not think the Board can be charged with any partiality towards nuns—quite the contrary. There will be paid for music in the same way, and even work-mistresses will be paid in mixed schools.

23220. Do you speak of these things as matters within your own knowledge?—Yes, I could instance a convent school to which a great deal of what you say does not apply. About twelve months ago a branch of the Sisters of Mercy were brought to Ballydoonagh. They brought together a large school. They have no nuns there except mistresses they picked up from amongst their own children and qualified. They have no other mistresses appointed in the school, but what any other school would have. They get a certain number proportional to the average attendance, two hundred or three hundred, or something of that kind. If the teacher were a secular teacher the same number of mistresses of the same standing would be appointed to it and get the same payment. Yet the nuns there have very little to support them and are very poorly paid

—in fact, they receive nothing for their own labours but the allowance under the stipendium grant.

23221. The Chairman.—Do you know of any cases in which Roman Catholic clergymen give instruction in schools under Protestant management?—I do not.

23222. Do you know of many cases in which Protestant clergymen attend to give instruction in schools under Roman Catholic management?—I don't know any instance of it. I was never applied to for permission by any clergymen.

23223. Mr. Sullivan.—In your district are there many of the schools under the Robertson bequest?—There is one in the town and parish of Raphoe, it is at the same time a National school. There are some others which I cannot name at present.

23224. Are the schools under that bequest generally associated with the National Board?—I don't know, of my own knowledge, any but the one school.

23225. That is, to a very large extent, a Protestant school?—As far as I know it is an exclusively Protestant school. I know that some years ago I heard there were some Catholics going to that school because there was an inefficient Catholic teacher in the National school under the Catholic manager. That teacher died and a first-class man was appointed, and now they have all gathered to him.

[Adjourned.]

# FIFTY-SIXTH DAY.—DUBLIN, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1863.

## PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

SIR ROBERT KANE, B.L.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKER, Esq., M.C.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES ALSTON DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASHVILLE STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.D.  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MEE, Esq., Q.C. } Secretaries.  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

JAMES WILLIAM KAVANAGH, Esq., further examined.

23226. The Chairman.—Are there any documents referred to in your former evidence that you wish to get in?—Yes, my lord, there are four. These are—First, an Analysis, by Provision, of the number of schools, the total number of pupils on the roll, and also the average number, the total daily attendance, and the average daily attendance in each school; the whole result of grants, in salaries, premiums, and otherwise, to the schools, and the average grant to each school; and also a ratio of total grants, on the basis of the percentage of the payments in the four provinces, assuming those to Munster as the basis (100).

23227. Mr. Gibson.—What does that refer to?—On the face of the document it is headed "Provincial Analysis, &c. . . . Report of National Board, 1864."

23228. What year is it for?—The year 1860 alone, being the last available.

23229. Extending from what time to what time?—A whole single year.

23230. And from what document is it taken?—It is an analysis of the last report of the National Board, that for 1867 not being out yet, save the text only.

23231. From what document is it compiled?—The summary tables, the provincial analysis of school attendance and grants, in report of National Board for 1864. The next document I beg to hand in is a copy of a Parliamentary Return—a copy of the O'Reilly Returns—No. 350 of the year 1864, with a column added by me, giving the average State grants per pupil, reduced to a centesimal basis (assuming the grants to Catholics as 100), according to the creed—management, as

Dec. 5, 1863.

JAMES Wm KAVANAGH,  
Esq.

\* Provincial Analysis of Schools, Attendance and Grants—Report of National Board, 1866.

PROVINCES.	No of Schools in Operation, 1860.	No on Roll		Average Daily Attendance		Percent of average number on roll as Catholics, as compared to Total on Roll.	State Grant.		Ratio of Grants per pupil as compared to those in other religions, as 100.
		Total.	Average per School.	Total.	Per School.		Salaries, Gratifications, &c., from State.	Total per 100 Pupils as Daily Average.	
Ulster, . . . .	2,382	317,457	134	102,623	42 8	32	89,910	87 82	125
Munster, . . . .	1,376	241,516	155	92,537	60 0	39	67,688	70 2	100
Leinster, . . . .	1,695	201,750	140	73,118	49 2	34 8	58,321	80 14	115
Connaught, . . . .	1,029	150,094	146	45,887	44 6	30 5	32,500	76 16	101
Total, . . . .	6,482	910,819	141	316,225	49	34 7	247,661	78 5	—

Dec 2, 1865.  
James Wm.  
Kearney, Esq.

patrons of the schools; also, Established Church, Presbyterian, Dissenting, and Catholic.\*

43233. The *Catechisms*.—Is there any further document you wish to put in?—Yes; I now beg to hand in a Return giving an account, under the several heads of grant, in salaries, &c., in the year 1862 to Model schools, with the average cost per pupil in each of them; in Ordinary schools under first-class teachers,

under second-class teachers, under third-class teachers, and under probationers, and under all grades taken together; and also in Convent schools, with a short table added, from myself, to make the other items more intelligible. The Return is compiled from a Parliamentary Paper, (A. J. No. 3), No. 157—1864, moved for by Sir Hugh Cairns, &c.

MODEL, ORDINARY, AND CONVENT SCHOOLS, 1862—ATTENDANCE AND GRANT PER PUPIL.

Female Schools, Year ending 31st December, 1902	No. of Schools	No. of Pupils				Average per Pupil from Grants, Year ending 31st December, 1902								Ratio of Grants per Pupil those in Convent being 100	
		On Roll		Average Attendance		Teachers Salary		Paid Monitors		Pre- moneys		Indus- trial In- struction			Total
		Total.	Average per School	Total.	Per School	s. d.	p.	s. d.	p.	s. d.	p.	s. d.	p.		
Model Schools,	49	9,386	191.6	4,290	87.5	24 0	11 4	0 3	0 4	36 6	100	36 6	100		
Ordinary Schools under	I. Class Teachers,	226	34,958	154.9	12,510	55.6	18 7	2 9	0 6	0 3	19 6	52.1	52.1		
	II. Class,	494	64,329	129.6	23,001	46.5	12 7	1 6	0 4	0 7	15 2	21.0	21.0		
	III. Class,	744	81,692	107.9	28,287	37	10 5	0 7	0 2	0 5	12 1	15.6	15.6		
	Probationers,	149	14,292	95.6	5,000	33.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
	I II III. Class and Probationers,	1,635	105,338	118.6	68,998	42.1	12 2	1 4	0 4	0 5	14 4	19.8	19.8		
Convent Schools,	129	68,566	531.5	28,099	217.3	4 1	2 5	0 5	0 3	7 2	100	7 2	100		

Female Schools		Per cent.		No. of Pupils	
On Roll	Present				
49 Model,	4,290	4.2	24,000	4,290	
1,635 Ordinary,	68,998	68.1	125,000	68,998	
129 Convent,	28,099	27.7	68,566	28,099	
1,812 Total,	100		273,406	101,167	

\* None, themselves, received only 4d. of Gr., viz.—4d. 5d. Capitation, and 5d. Premiums.

Fourth Table, on the subject of grants, is taken from Table II. of *Grogan's Return*, of grants to Convent schools, under the heads of Capitation, Premiums and Gratification, Industrial Instruction, Paid Monitors, and total. It is No. 439 Session 1864, and refers to the years 1860, 1861, 1862, and 1863. Its importance, in connection with my past evidence, lies in this, that it shows that a considerable amount, now more

than half, of the grants given to Convent Schools is not received by the Nuns. They are only the channels through which it passes to Paid Monitors, all of whom are appointed directly by the Board, through the Inspectors, to which the *Catechists* of Ireland strongly object, as a grave invasion of local rights, accorded under Lord Stanley's early system.

GRANTS TO CONVENT SCHOOLS—1860-3.

Year.	Average Daily Attendance	No. of Schools	Grant from National Board.														
			Capitation.			Premiums and Gratification.			Industrial Instruction.			Faid Monitors.			Total.		
			£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1860	25,071	124	8,199	12	1	324	5	301	0	0	2,219	9	8	8,644	6	9	
1861	25,077	128	8,388	4	11	321	5	301	1	8	2,891	6	8	9,301	18	5	
1862	28,008	129	8,716	12	11	377	5	351	11	8	3,499	3	7	10,148	18	9	
1863	30,405	134	9,181	8	4	785	5	436	8	4	4,459	0	1	11,660	18	9	

\* TABLE compiled from O'NEILL'S RETURN (No. 200—1864) of amount per pupil, in daily average attendance, during the year 1863, paid in Salaries, Gratifications, Premiums, &c., of all descriptions.

In National Schools under Management of	Salaries.	Gratifications, &c.	Total.	Ratio of Grants, those in Catholic schools being 100
Established Church,	16 1	6	16 7	100
Presbyterian "	16 7	6	16 1	117
Dissenting, &c., "	13 1	3	13 4	97
Roman Catholic "	13 3	4	13 9	100

From the above return is excluded all schools under aided and aided management, as Model, Wickham, &c., Asylum, &c.



Dec. 5, 1868.

James Wm.  
Kavanaugh,  
esq.

22233. Mr. Deane.—Have you any other document in hand in respecting that portion of your evidence relating to the late Right Rev. Dr. Doyle?—Yes. The name of the late illustrious Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, having been largely referred to in my former examination of the 15th July, and several questions, mentioned 12484 to 12495, having been put to me, founded on the supposed learning of that great prelate towards national education, I beg leave to supplement my answers with the following brief extracts from Dr. Doyle's "Life and Works." In one of his celebrated letters on the state of Ireland, pleading for a great and liberal scheme of public education, he says (I read from volume 1, page 356)—

22234. Mr. Gibbes.—Is that Fitzpatrick's Life?—Yes. He says:

"Do we wish or require to be instructed with the public instruction? No. We wish only that the portion of it which regards ourselves be instructed to us. We do not desire to put our souls into another man's hands. All we require is that you observe the commandment of Christ—'Whatever you wish that men should do to you, do ye also to them in like manner.' You would not consider the instruction of your children to us. Do not oblige us to intrust ours to you. As to the State bestowing aid, we feel indebted for it. We will be grateful for it. We shall not even think, if you will, that the State exists, only for the good of the people—that we are its subjects—that we pay its taxes, supply its libraries, bear all its burdens, fight and die for its aggrandisement or glory. We will waive all right to the public money of the State, and the Legislature will want, exporting the crumbs. All this we will do only do not affect us, by arrogating your authority between us and our children. Do not intrude from us the minds or affections of our little ones, or teach them from their infancy to regard the stranger as entitled to their confidence. Do not intrude to them that their Parents or Pastors are unfit to train their minds, or inform their hearts, or introduce them to the world. If you think to subvert them from the faith in which we have suffered and into which we have been baptised, know it, and tell us, and we will retire with them into the desert and tell our ministrations to the rocks, or we will cease to baptise children in our bondage, and let our names be forgotten and our race be extinguished."

22235. Mr. Gibbes.—What is the date of that?—It is in his Seventh Letter (Letter of J. K. L.) on the State of Ireland.

22236. Have you the date?—It is about the year 1835 or 1836. I cannot tell the precise date.

22237. That was during the time of the agitation about the Kildare-place Society?—Yes, certainly.

22238. Then it was long before the establishment of the National Board in 1831?—Certainly, five or six years. On the subject of the primary schools of his own diocese, Dr. Doyle, in a circular to his clergy, in giving directions for fitting up parochial schools, says—

22239. The Chairman.—Give the date?—I think it was the year 1835. He says—

"In all these Schools, Religion shall be the first and last occupation of the child—to raise his pure hands to Heaven, as it is the first duty assigned him by his Creator, so shall it be the groundwork of all the instruction he may receive. Indulgence shall not be banished. The same dangerous infection from our Schools. A child shall not be taught to imitate the Summary of the Law of God, to converse with Heaven by itself, to devote some perverted Inspector, and shield himself by his No. In our Schools Religious Instruction shall be the basis of Education, and this Religious Instruction will continue whatever can contribute to mould the heart to virtue, to subdue the thoughts, to regulate the affections, and prepare the mind of the child for that world, full of danger, into which, on leaving School, he is obliged to enter."

22240. Mr. Deane.—As the first extract you read from Dr. Doyle's "Life and Works," applied to a period anterior to the introduction of the National system, what was the object of reading it, and how do you apply it to the object of the present inquiry?—Dr. Doyle there lays down, as *eternum*, Catholic principles, without reference to any system, any details, or

any scheme of school management. He sees apprehension of the Catholic children being estranged from their Catholic parents owing to the inferior part they are entitled to take in the matter of education, and he points to the dangers connected with it. It is principles that Dr. Doyle deals with, and not systems or details, and therefore his solemn utterances are of importance, at all times.

22241. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You have referred largely to the opinion of Dr. Doyle in the years 1825, 1836, and 1839. Was the National system of education at present in operation in view of the public at that time?—Clearly not.

22242. Was Dr. Doyle in favour of the new system of education introduced in 1831 at any time?—Favourable to the new system as then projected?

22243. Did he show in any way his approval by practical action?—Yes.

22244. In what way?—By a Circular to his Clergy, telling them to enter on the experiment.

22245. Did he ask them to place their schools under the National Board of Education?—Yes, with the alternative, as he says, "that should we be again doomed to disappointment, we are not as dumb dogs that know not how to bark. We can readily exclude the Commissioners, their books, and their agents from our schools."

22246. Have you ever said that Dr. Doyle approved of the system so far by practical action, and of model schools, as projected by the Commissioners of Education?—No, Dr. Doyle never approved of the Model Schools of the Board.

22247. Have you ever said he hailed the establishment of model schools in connexion with the National system of education?—No, never. I will tell you what I did say. He could not have approved of the District Model Schools, first opened more than fifteen years after his death.

22248. It is satisfactory to me if you answer the questions. He never did, you say?—He never approved of the Board's Model Schools.

22249. Did he approve of the principle of the system of which they form a part?—He not only approved of "Model Schools," but had model schools in his own diocese for the training of the teachers.

22250. I refer to his approval of the model schools as projected by the Commissioners of National Education?—The Commissioners did not project the model schools at the time Dr. Doyle wrote his letter. (Question repeated.) Dr. Doyle's letter is dated the 26th December, 1831. The Commissioners first met as a Commission, on the first day of that month. They first sat to consider grants or receive applications, at the end of January, 1832, so that a National school did not exist until February, 1832. Lord Stanley's letter contains no reference to State model schools, or a project for State model schools. He proposes a model school in Dublin, meaning a training school. Dr. Doyle never wrote anything on the subject of National education after the system was brought into operation.

22251. Who was the first party to indulge in attacks on the scheme of training of teachers, model schools, and so on?—I cannot say.

22252. You cannot say? Have you ever said?—No; not in the terms of your question, certainly.

22253. Have you ever said that while a certain party opposed the scheme Dr. Doyle approved of it?—I am not aware.

22254. Will you recognise your own words in the following?—

"Thus it is evident that the local model schools, instead of being a new idea or a new feature in the National system, have, from the beginning, been the means to which the Commissioners looked, and on which they confidently relied, for giving completeness and solidity to their system of training teachers; and it may not be unworthy to notice that one of the first attacks made on the scheme was by the Bishop of Exeter, in a speech in the House of Lords, a few months after its promulgation; while within two months of the issuing of Lord Stanley's letter, empowering the com-

\* See Dr. Doyle's "Rules and Regulations for Schools, &c.," already quoted by the Witness in his Evidence, Q. 22290, page 516.

Dec 5, 1868.  
—  
James Wm  
Kearney,  
csg.

tion of the National Board, Dr. Doyle forwarded a circular, instructing his clergy to place their schools under the new Board, and in which his lordship states:—"The rule which requires that all teachers heretofore to be employed be provided from some model school, with a certificate of their competency, will aid us in a work of great difficulty—to wit, that of suppressing hedge schools, and placing youth under the direction of competent teachers, and of those only."

Do you recollect that?—Perfectly, and in that, there is no inconsistency whatever; but I would ask your lordship to request Dr. Wilson to say from what he is reading. I ask the authority for that document. Is it a public or a private document?

22255. Do you acknowledge that as part of your unpublished report, to which reference was made by you on a former day?—I deliberately withdrew any secret I gave to its recognition, until it is put in, conformably with the law of evidence, whether as a public document or a private letter.

[At this stage the room was cleared. On returning, the examination was resumed as follows:—]

22256. The Chairman.—Will you look at that paper, and say if it is in your handwriting (paper headed to witness)?—It is.

22257. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you acknowledge the portion I have read as part of that document?—When I identify it. (The witness reads the portion.)

22258. Have you identified that as part of your own document?—Yes.

22259. Can you say at what time it was written?—I think it is part of a general report referring to the General Model School, the year 1851. I say that from memory.

22260. Are you now referred to 1851, or to a much later period, 1854?—I believe, trusting to memory, that the report refers to the year 1851. I find nothing in the part of the document before me, internally, to lead me to decide, but that is not of the slightest consequence.

22261. Does your memory serve you with regard to the writing of that document—the preparation of that document?—No.

22262. Are you aware that the document furnishes internal evidence that it refers to model schools, and that the report must have referred to 1854?—So far as I am concerned, it is perfectly immaterial.

22263. Was not your object to show that Dr. Doyle approved of the united system of education and model school training, while the Bishop of Exeter was opposed to it?—It is impossible I could have so much. Never at any period of my existence did I mean anything of the sort just stated. I never thought, much less wrote that, in reference to Dr. Doyle's opinions.

22264. Who were the parties specially opposed to the model school system?—The Catholics are now very much opposed to it.

22265. Who were the parties who had in view as specially opposed to the model school system?—In the year 1854 the Catholic opposition had covered a formidable shape in a few localities, and was opposing and gathering in others.

22266. Who were the parties who had specially in view when you prepared that document?—I cannot say, as the whole Report is not before me.

22267. Were they the Roman Catholic bishops?—Certainly not.

22268. Did you ever charge the parties to whom you referred in that document with being business?—No. But produce the document.

22269. Or say that their toleration of the National system, so far as it means mixed education, is merely seeming, and not sincere?—I don't think I did.

22270. Have you ever said that the Commissioners neither exercise nor claim any privilege or authority over these schools beyond that which their rules and regulations grant to the managers of the ordinary National schools?—I am certain I did, and I now repeat it.

22271. And that the rules and regulations practised

in every National school are those which, without alteration or modification are carried out in every model school?—I now repeat the same, and it is existing at this instant.

22272. Have you said that to anyone not the slave of prejudice and dishonesty these schools themselves should command themselves, and the rules and regulations of the schools?—I may have said it. I don't recollect. But I am quite certain I would not say it now.

22273. Have you not said that the opposition to model schools is in reality because of opposition to the cause of united education generally?—I firmly believed it, and believe it now.

22274. You do not regard these schools as a new feature of the system?—One of them is as old as 1833. You constantly confound distinct or local model schools, spread over the country, with the one central training school—therefore there appears to be a conflict between your questions and my answers, and an unnecessary with regard to my answers that this will explain. Dr. Doyle was more favourable to a training school.

22275. Do you regard these schools to which you refer in that document, as a new feature of the system?—Distinct model schools were a new feature of the system, dating from 1849, whilst the system dates from 1831.

22276. Have you ever said they were not a new feature of the system?—Never in the sense you state.

22277. Have you combated the views and met the objections of the bishops in a masterly argument upon the subject?—Never of the bishops.

22278. Have you advocated and approved of them as good training schools?—I approved of them, never more strongly with regard to the excellence of character of the secular instruction aimed at in them than I have done in portions of my examination before this Commission. I ask you, again, to read the whole document.

22279. Mr. Stoker.—Is it a complete one?—Not at all. It is only an unpublished portion of a long general report on the General model schools, for 1851.

22280. Mr. Sullivan.—Is that the suppressed part of the report now before you?—It is.

22281. Is the remainder of the report in print?—The remainder was published for 1851.

22282. What preceded and what followed that portion?—This is a portion of a long report upon a single model school, and this portion was omitted by the Commissioners for reasons of their own.

22283. Do you consider that another example of exhibition of opacity?—Clearly.

22284. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I ask the witness to have the kindness to read this document?—With pleasure I will bow to your lordship's decision. In the document to be read on the condition that I shall be examined on it with regard both to that and to the remainder of the report? I respectfully decline to read it, if that is not done.

[At this stage the Commissioners adjourned for a short time. On returning, the examination was continued as follows:—]

22285. The Chairman.—Can you state to the Commissioners of what document this paper is a portion?—I am satisfied that it is a portion of my report on the General model schools for the year 1851.

22286. How the whole of that report been published?—The remainder of the report has been, but the passages, the fifteen or sixteen pages of manuscript in your lordship's hands, have not.

22287. Referring to your letter of the 5th of November, in which you gave to the Commissioners a list of certain schools which you had visited, and in which you say you found violations of the new rule of 1851, what rule do you refer to?—Rule 15, sec. 4.

22288. At what date did you visit the Portadown school?—The 8th of September, 1858.

22289. Did anybody accompany you?—No.

\* The entire Report, including the portion published by the Commissioners of National Education, is the Appendix to their Report for 1851, and the portion then omitted, will be found in the Appendix to the Evidence, No. 14.

Dec 1, 1859

James Wm. Kavanagh, esq.

22290. Was the manager present in the school, or only the teacher?—The teachers only.

22291. Was this a boys' or girls' school?—A mixed school of boys and girls, a very large one, having 220 boys on roll, and 171 girls, or a total of 391.

22292. How many Roman Catholics were on the rolls?—Forty-three, out of a total, on the rolls, of 391.

22293. Do you know what the religious denomination of the principal teacher was?—Presbyterian.

22294. What is the infraction of the rules as to religious instruction which you observed?—Religious instruction was going on, during the time of my visit. I remained during the whole of its continuance. I entered the school at half-past nine o'clock, when the scholars were assembling. Religious instruction begins at ten o'clock, and lasts till a quarter to eleven daily, and consists of reading the Scriptures and repeating the Catechism, meaning the Shorter Catechism of the General Assembly. When it was ten o'clock, the children went off to their Scripture classes, and the assistant teachers took them in charge. Meanwhile, as it was important to me to commence my visit, I said to the teacher "Though I know it is, strictly speaking, a violation of the rule—though I have no authority to restrain here—I came here for a particular purpose, and you will, I am sure, have no objection to let me examine the official books." He did. I went down through the school. He invited me to examine one of the Bible-classes. I did so, and was rather pleased with their answering. I found two Catholic children present at the early part of religious instruction, not receiving or taking part in it, but present in the room. He said the Catholics were accustomed to then drop in. I wholly acquit the master of having any design on the Catholic children. I believe him to be an honest and a respectable man. He said the children come in and go about, but were not forced or compelled. But the master, under the rule, was bound to put them out.

22295. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—He said that?—No, I say that.

22296. Are the closing words of your answer your own, or the master's?—My own; I am stating to you what the master's duty and obligations were.

22297. That is, you instructed the master as to his duty?—No, but I inform the Commissioners that there was a violation of the rule, consisting in this, that the teacher allowed the children to be present, though not, I think, with any bad or evil design; and that it was the master's duty, under the new rule of the Board, to put out the Catholic children, during the time he was giving Protestant religious instruction.

22298. The Chairman.—Can you state whether those two children were present at the beginning of religious instruction, or whether they came in late, while the religious instruction was going on?—They merely dropped in, the teacher stated, as a practical school-master, that it could not be avoided, and appealed to my knowledge of schools, in proof.

22299. Is there any class-room or other department to which such children could resort while religious instruction was going on?—Yes, there is.

22300. Mr. O'Shea.—What was the time mentioned in the Time Table for religious instruction?—Ten to ten three-quarters o'clock, daily.

22301. Am I to understand that those children were not in the school at the beginning of religious instruction?—I cannot say; but they were there during the religious instruction. I called attention to the fact of those Roman Catholic children being there, and the master, fairly, went into an explanation—they were there, before me, during the time of religious instruction.

22302. Did the master volunteer the statement?—No, I questioned him very closely about it, but he finally volunteered the explanation, how it could not be avoided.

22303. You said you yourself took a class and began to examine. Were those children in your Bible class?—No, not in the Bible class.

22304. Where were they in the school?—In the school-room.

22305. What part of the school—at the first?—I don't know whether there was a fire or not. They were in the school-room, going about, within hearing of, but not receiving instruction. But they were present in the room. It is almost the mildest form of violation that could occur under the rule.

22306. Can you tell the names of those children?—No, I would not ask anything of the sort.

22307. Mr. Stokes.—Are you certain it was a Presbyterian school?—I heard so from the master.

22308. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you sure it was under the National Board?—I don't think I should be asked that question, having been for twenty-four years connected with the National Board and as Head Inspector, visiting National schools in every county in Ireland.

22309. Were those children receiving any part of the instruction commended?—None, whatever.

22310. How far were they removed from the class under instruction?—They were going about, freely, amongst the desks, and through the aisles of the school, but taking no part whatever in it, but the teacher was bound, under the rule, as there was no certificate authorizing their presence, to put them out. There was no further violation than that. As these profess to be protective rules—and it was the special object of my mission to ascertain how the rule are peacefully protective or not—it is my duty to expose their violation. It is not a question about the two children only, because the whole forty-three Catholic children on the rolls are similarly exposed.

22311. Who were giving religious instruction?—The several teachers, including six assistants and monitors.

22312. Was the principal teacher present?—He was beside me the whole time of my visit.

22313. Did he allow the children to be moving about freely through the classes while religious instruction was being given?—He did, two children.

22314. Now, as I presume you regarded that as a violation of the law, did you call upon the manager of the school to make any representation about it?—No; it was no business of mine. I neither had nor assumed any authority, whatever. I was a mere private gentleman.

22315. The Chairman.—Did you make any entry on the visitors' book of your visit?—I left the date and my name, there and in every public school that I visited, in the North of Ireland.

22316. Master Brooke.—In bringing charges of violation of rule against a particular school, do you not see the necessity of enabling the Commission to identify the particular locality?—Yes, if I could have anticipated that the school could not be readily found in the Board's Reports. Which is it more likely that a mistake or difficulty of identity, as to names of localities, would occur in the Board's Report, as to this one of several National schools in Portadown, or that a visitor of my kind, who gives all the details, dates, books, and numbers present, obtained on a visit made to the school within three months, could be mistaken, as to its being, or not being, a National school?

22317. Are you able to give the name of the street in Portadown, in which the school is?—I am not. It is attached to the leading Meeting-house, not far from the railway, and within two minutes' walk of the chief hotel. The name of the school is, I find, Edensbury, Roll No. 6393, Parish of Seagon, co. Armagh.

22318. The Chairman.—Did you visit a school in Queen-street, Lurgan?—Yes, I did, on the 8th of September; the same day that I visited the other in Portadown.

22319. Is the roll number 87794?—That is the school, Queen-street, Lurgan, parish of Shankhill, co. Armagh.

22320. Under Presbyterian management?—Yes.

22321. How many Roman Catholics were either present or on the rolls the day you visited it?—There is a mixed school of boys and girls, and on the rolls, that day, there were fifty-four boys and sixty-three girls, or a total of 117—and of those 117 children, sixteen are Roman Catholics.

Dec. 5, 1868.

James Wm  
Kearney,  
crg.

22322. Do you know what denomination the principal teacher was?—Presbyterian, I think.

22323. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you not sure?—Not certain, nor does it affect the information I have to give.

22324. The Chairman.—Did you observe any violation of the rule with regard to religious instruction there?—Yes, very serious violations of the spirit, and of the letter of the rule, also.

22325. Will you describe them?—First, the Catholic parents are canvassed by the teachers to sign this Certificate Book, which is a violation of the whole spirit of the rule of 1856-7. The Commissioners issued the following Minute, already given in evidence (Q. 19387), explaining the object of the rule:—

“The object of the rule is more fully to carry out the general principle of the Board, that no child is to receive any religious instruction contrary to the wishes of its parent.”

Which clearly implies that parents or teachers are not to send for the parents to canvass them, nor ask them do they consent to this, that, and the other. I may mention that this—to take an illustration from railway life, is shuffling from the old Notice System to the new Rule of 1856, in order to bring all the Catholic children that between 1847-1860, had been under proselytizing practices, contrary to the whole spirit of the system, within the operation of the new Certificate Book, for the purpose of legalizing, under the new Rule, of 1856, the improper practices secured under the old one of 1847-1856.

22326. Were you present in the school while any religious instruction was going on?—Certainly.

22327. Were there any Roman Catholics present?—Yes.

22328. Mr. Walker.—What was the date of the Circular?—It was forwarding a Minute of the Board dated the 26th of February, 1867, explanatory of the New Rule of 1856.

22329. The Chairman.—Will you state what you observed with reference to those Roman Catholic children?—I found three Roman Catholics out of the sixteen on Roll, present at the time of religious instruction, which was being given while I was in the room. This, in itself constitutes no violation of the new rule of the Board, but when I came to inquire into the Certificates and how they were obtained from the parents, I ascertained that the teacher asks the parents to sign the Certificate Book. She had been assisted under the late teacher, who did so, by direction of the Petron.

22330. From whom did you acquire this information?—From the principal teacher, Sarah A. Congrow, six mothers and four fathers signed their names or their marks, chiefly the latter, to Certificates authorizing their whole or portion of the course of religious instruction given in the school, that course being exclusively Protestant.

22331. Would that be a certificate which would be revocable under the rules by the parents?—Certainly. In the Preamble (Q. 15,503), it is stated that such expression of desire may, at any time, be revoked by the parent, and such revocation renders the Certificate inoperative.

22332. Were there any Roman Catholic children present, namely, as in the last-mentioned school?—No; they were present under the authority of the Certificates.

22333. Your point in this case is, that, in your opinion, the parents were unfairly canvassed to sign?—The parents were canvassed by the teacher, by direction of the manager of the school. And now I am to state what was the actual class of children, and what was the inducement to the parents. The school, though attached to the Methodist church, is under the patronage of a Presbyterian clergyman. It was known as the Ragged School, up to about two years ago; the children got food in the school—a meat and soup dinner, dolly, and porridge every morning; but the funds of the school having gone down, they are now reduced to bread, at mid-day; and they also get clothes, at half price.

22334. Did the teacher state to you that she can-

vassed the parents, by direction of the manager?—Distinctly; and told me the very terms in which she did so. Then, for illustration, “Mrs. So-and-so, do you wish your child to have all the advantages of the school?” “To be sure I do.” “All the advantages?” “Certainly.” “Religious instruction, and all the advantages of the school. If so, you are to sign your name here.” “I cannot write.” “I will fill it for you, and we will get some one to sign it.” The trap is, “all the advantages of the school,” which any parent would understand to mean the usual common literary advantages of a school. This is the trap for the unfortunate parents. Some of these children are illegitimate—waste of the immorality of a large manufacturing town. I must say, that in the worst days of Soup and proselytizing societies in Ireland, I never met with a much worse case than this.

22335. Mr. Walker.—According to the rule of the Board, is it not the father should sign?—The rule of the Board is, that if there is a difference of creed, then the father must sign, but if it is well known to the teacher that the parents are of one creed, and that there is no hitch or difficulty about it, he certainly would accept the mother's signature; but, in a case of mixed marriage, it would be illegal.

22336. Mr. Gibson.—Did you apply the word “canvassing” to the fact of the teacher in the school asking that question of the mother, when the mother brought the child to her?—I do.

22337. Did the teacher go to the house?—The teacher sent to the parents, in the case of those that were on the roll at the time the new rule came into operation, which is explained by what I have described before—“Shunting” from the old to the new rule; whilst in the case of new entries, the teacher had an opportunity of canvassing the parents, if they came with the children, which they rarely do, to enter them. As a general rule, the parents were sent for.

22338. Do you apply the word “canvassing” to the fact of the teacher asking the question of the parent?—I do apply it.

22339. That is what you call canvassing?—I do call it a species of canvassing.

22340. You said it was canvassing—now you say it is a species of canvassing?—Certainly; because there are different grades of canvassing. Sending for a parent is one of the worst forms of canvassing.

22341. What time of the day did you go to that school?—About three o'clock. I was there from three to half-past three o'clock, while religious instruction was going on.

22342. Did you look at the Time Table to see what hour religious instruction was for?—Yes; I always do that.

22343. Those parents you say the teacher sent for; had they their children at the school before the new rule came into force?—Some of them had.

22344. Did she send for all the parents of all the children in the school?—No; I did not say that she did.

22345. What parents did she send for when the new regulation came in force?—The teacher told me she was not long in office, as principal teacher—that she had been assistant before—that the parents were sent for by her predecessor, and that she followed the same practice with regard to the new entries since, so she knew that the late teacher was directed to do so by the petron.

22346. The Chairman.—Was there anybody with you at the school?—Oh, no, my lord; but I met the petron, twice that day, in the town.

22347. Mr. Gibson.—What is the name of the petron?—The Rev. L. E. Berkeley, who, I think, had been a witness before this Commission.

22348. The Chairman.—Had you any conversation with him?—None, whatever, my lord.

22349. Mr. Deane.—With respect to the mothers who signed, are you aware whether they had husbands who were available to sign, or whether they were widows?—The teacher told me some of their children were illegitimate.

22350. Were there any other Roman Catholic chil-

Dec 3, 1902.  
James W. Barnard,  
esq.

even attending that school, besides those whom you found at religious instruction?—Yes. I found only three Catholics present at religious instruction, out of sixteen on the roll; but there is a great difference between the number ordinarily present, and the number on the rolls. Sixteen on roll would give five accustomed to attend, diffy.

22354. For how many of the total number of Roman Catholic children whose names were on the roll had their parents signed Certificates?—I found ten certificates, altogether, in the book, extending to fifteen children. I found sixteen on the roll; but the chief point, with regard to this case, is the first example of the sort, in the use made of this new rule. It is only going from the Notice System to another still worse, with documents to legalize a practice that I believe to be contrary to all fair play, with regard to the state-aided public primary schools of the Kingdom.

22355. Mr. Gibson.—Is not the teacher bound to see that the parent fully understands the nature of the Certificate?—The teacher is bound by the rule to do so.

22356. Can he do so without asking questions?—Certainly not. But, in the first instance, the question should not be asked whether the parent would or would not sign. It is contrary to the whole spirit of the rule of 1894.

22357. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it the duty of the Inspector of the district, to see that the rule is observed?—It is certainly his duty, to this extent. He is to examine the Certificates signed by the teacher, and having examined them, in any way he thinks fit, he is then to attest the fairness of the entry. How is it to be done? It is impossible the Inspectors could properly test each case—absolutely impossible. Suppose the signatures are forged, of which I will be able to produce evidence, here—in the Inspector to go about the country, over a radius of three miles round, and question parents with regard to the authenticity and genuineness of the signature? It could not be done.

22358. You said in the case of these sixteen children, that they were all accustomed to attend?—No.

22359. What did you say?—I said I found Certificates for fifteen children on the Certificate Book, and that there were sixteen on the rolls. Therefore, the whole sixteen might be said to attend, though I found but three Catholics present, and going religious instruction, while I was in the room. I called attention to the difference between the number on the roll and the number present. Therefore you are to take for granted that the others do attend.

22360. So that, even with the inducement you referred to, there is not now a full attendance?—I don't know anything about the attendance, beyond what I have stated.

22361. Taking the three children whom you found present as a standard?—I don't know that that has anything to say to it. I found three present, and sixteen on the roll. That is not unusual. I visited, 8th September, one of the lowest seasons of the year.

22362. So that the inducements to which you referred have not increased the daily average attendance?—That was only for a day.

22363. Taking the three Roman Catholics as an example?—Visiting the school for a day, surely does not enable me to say what was the daily average attendance, with regard to Catholics.

22364. Was there anything peculiar in the character of this school?—In what respect?

22365. In any respect?—Oh yes, very peculiar.

22366. Did you know or hear of anything peculiar in the case of this school?—I did not know of the existence of the school until I went into it, by mere accident.

22367. Did you discover anything peculiar in the history of the school?—The only point in its history I inquired or cared about was whether there was any material inducement given to Roman Catholic children to falsify what their Church teaches, and what they believe, and I found that there was.

22368. You have referred to three?—I have mentioned three.

22369. In convent schools do you find clothes given

and food given—inducements of that kind given?—Yes, but only to "the household of the faith."

22370. Is that a proof that the design in convent schools is to proselytise?—It is absurd to talk of Catholics proselytising Catholics—it is to the household of the faith relief is given in Convent schools. If I found the same, in a Presbyterian school, I could not object to it.

22371. The Chairwoman.—Do you allege that the gifts of food and clothing were given especially to Roman Catholics?—No; they were given, generally, to the poor, but by these destitute Roman Catholics were tempted to publicly falsify the teaching of their Church—in other words, to become hypocrites; there is no other name for it, for no Roman Catholic believes in the scheme of religious instruction propounded in Protestant schools.

22372. Mr. Gibson.—Should they refuse to give food and clothes to Roman Catholic poor children in the school?—No; I don't think they should.

22373. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are there in that school Protestants of different denominations who receive food from day to day?—I understand all the poor children received it, without reference to religion.

22374. Should you think it fair that Roman Catholic children should be refused food, while others received it?—No; I think the food ought to be given to all who need it—that the poor ought to be assisted, quite irrespective of whether they are Christian or Pagan. But I believe that the special object of this relief was to allure the Roman Catholic destitute, to trade on their wants, and get them to attend the school, and falsify their religious principles, by joining in a course of religious instruction which they disbelieve.

22375. Do you charge that on the school, because it is under the National Board, or because it is under the management of a Presbyterian clergyman?—I would say the same, if I found it done by Roman Catholics, against a poor Protestant minority, just as heartily as I would say it against the West-Connought Mission Society.

22376. Are you aware this was a Ragged School previously in existence, and not connected with the National Board?—I am not aware of it. Perhaps it was. Its antecedents run its mission do not concern me beyond my present object.

22377. Are you aware that when it was established, even as a ragged school, and not connected with the Board of Education, its principle was that of non-compulsion?—It only shows the absurdity of supposing that the school has been made better by the connection, for, like the devil in the Gospel, "the second state of that man is worse than the first." It is as bad as, any worse, than when it had not the supposed protective rules of the National Board, with the addition that Roman Catholic missionaries are now taxed to support it as a "serving" school.

22378. Who is the Inspector of the district?—Mr. Roseberry is the Acting-Inspector.

22379. Had you any communication with him?—None, whatever.

22380. Is he a Roman Catholic?—He is.

22381. Can you give the name of the teacher to whom you have referred?—Sarah A. Crogan.

22382. Can you give the name of her predecessor?—No; I don't see the name on my notes. The person referred to by me was her immediate predecessor.

22383. Do you mean to say the Teachers violated the rule by asking the Parent to sign the Certificate?—I do. The Board's Minute implies so.

22384. Should you not regard it as false, in case of doubt on the part of the teacher, that she should question the parent in reference to signing the Certificate?—She should no more ask a question than under the Poor Law Act, which I put in evidence on the last day I was examined (Q. 19577.) The civil registration of the child should be final and complete.

22385. Should you be disposed to think Roman Catholics would not in precisely the same way?—I am certain Roman Catholics would so act, and the one solitary case of seeming exception that I found would

Dec. 5, 1863.

James Wm.  
Kearney,  
esq.

have been the first brought forward, if I were allowed. It occurred at a Catholic school in this city—a case of one Protestant child who was taught the Catholic catechism, under a Certificate regularly drawn up by the legal guardian in charge of the child. I would bring it up with the same firmness as in the other case, to show the futility of the rule to protect minorities.

22383. You said the parents were canvassed—how were they canvassed?—By discreetly asking them, “Do you wish to have all the advantages of the school for your children?” Any parent would naturally understand this to mean the general instruction of the school. The teacher acknowledged to me the very form of expression she put to the parents—“Do you wish to have all the advantages of the school for your child?” “Of course I do.” “The most important reading lesson we have is the Bible lesson in the morning. Do you wish for all the advantages?” “I wish my child to have all the advantages.” “If so, sign this.” That which they sign is a difficult legal document, full of long hard words, which the people don’t understand.

22384. That is your opinion of the new rule of the Commissioners of National Education?—Yes, that the part of it to be read to parents is a difficult document.

22385. Do you not think that the teachers and Inspector are most anxious to have the children protected, and that it is owing to this anxiety they send for the parents, or visit the parents, and read for them the document to ascertain their wish on the matter?—I can answer only from the facts that came before me.

22386. Do you express a doubt upon the subject?—I have no doubt whatever that, in every instance, I may say, that came under my notice, of a Catholic parent signing this Certificate Book, by name or mark, to have his child taught an opposite religion, that it was obtained through misunderstanding, bribe, trick, or deceit of some form or other.

22387. In visiting this school what question did you put to Miss Cogrow on the subject?—Such questions as drew out the information I have given.

22388. Did you demand of her how her predecessors had got the signatures?—I asked her to explain to me her own course of action with regard to it.

22389. What explanations did she give?—She stated that she followed precedent—that her predecessor did so and so, while she was assistant to her principal, and that the latter did so under the direction of the patron.

22390. Did she say she was assistant when the new rule came into operation?—She stated she was assistant when the new rule was in operation, and gave me that account of its action.

22391. Did she not state she had been assistant previous to the new rule coming into operation?—I think I understood her to say that it was within her time the rule did come into operation, and that the teacher acted so and so, by direction of the patron.

22392. Did she tell you her predecessor had sent for the parents in order to read the rule to them?—I understood her to say so, distinctly.

22393. Did she tell you who caused her to send for them?—The patron, she told me.

22394. Are you sure she could not have named another party?—I am sure she did not name another party.

22395. Are you sure she did not name the Inspector?—No, she did not.

22396. Are you sure she did not say that the Inspector, who was a Roman Catholic, came into the school as soon as the new rule became law, and finding Roman Catholic children there, told the teacher to send for the parents and read the rule to them?—But, if the Inspector did so, he wholly misapprehended the spirit, drift, and design of the new rule.

22397. Did she tell you this?—She did not, nor did I ask her. I hear it now, for the first time.

22398. Did you endeavour to leave upon her mind the impression that you were a Royal or Assistant Commissioner?—I did not. The thought never entered

into my mind. I never was a candidate for either office; and with respect to that of Assistant Commissioner, I don’t think it is an office I would be very likely to accept.

22399. Did you find out that the requisite notice was sent to the Roman Catholics who told their children to remain?—She told me they were all noticed, under the old scheme; that is in my notes, and that “all stayed.” These are the very words in my notes.

22400. You have already acknowledged that when the new rule was introduced the patron told the teacher to send to those Roman Catholic parents and see if they would give their consent?—Yes, I so understood, from the teacher.

22401. Positive and express?—Yes.

22402. Did they give their consent?—I cannot say.

22403. Did you inquire?—I have a distinct statement on my notes, “All noticed under the old scheme—all stayed.”

22404. Was not that action on the part of the manager a proof of honesty and integrity in carrying out the new rule?—Of the very opposite, I think.

22405. Was there any other way to acquaint the parents with the change of rule?—He should have been perfectly silent on the subject. The very fact of being registered, as in the workhouse, “Roman Catholic,” was quite enough. They should not be asked “Are you willing to become a Protestant?” It is a contradiction in terms, on the very face of it.

22406. Did you inquire whether the teacher asked the parents to notify their permission by signing the Certificate, and that if they wished their children to return they had only to express that wish, and the children would be permitted to do so?—I don’t know that I asked any question about it. I found ten certificates of Roman Catholic parents authorizing their children to get different forms of Protestant religious instruction, and I inquired how did these come there.

22407. Did you ask the teacher if she did not, at the same time, inform the parents that their not doing so would not prevent their children from receiving the full benefit of secular instruction?—I don’t know that I asked; I cannot say.

22408. Mr. Sullivan—Are the two cases which you give under the two classes of tampering with children in the school—were they the only cases you could bring forward?—Not at all. There are cases all over Antrim, all through Belfast, in Down, and over the country, in most of the places I visited.

22409. Then they are selected as examples?—I beg your pardon. The way his lordship seems to take them up was from the order of my tour. The first town I went to was Portadown, and on the same day I went to Lurgan. It would be my itinerary, to go in that order; to follow the list before his lordship, would repeat the same abuses, over and over again.

22410. Rev. Dr. HWA—Having been asked to give in a list of cases, did you not put in this list those you thought best for your purpose?—Not at all. I merely took them in the order of my journal, now before me. I hand you the journal from which I copied them. I picked them out here and there. I gave them in the order of my route from Portadown to Lurgan, then to Belfast, and so on, through Down and Antrim.

22411. The Chairwoman—In the list which you have given in, are there any other cases which are like this case of Lurgan, confined to the question of canvassing?—Yes, my lord, numbers of cases. In Academy-street, Belfast (two schools), Corran, Beraghmore male, Elm-street (Belfast), Gulgore male and female, Gray’s, (5 schools, Ballymena,) Donaghadee, No. 2, Killybegs, Co. Down, &c., Chalkhill-street, and St. Anne’s, (Belfast).

22412. Male and female?—Yes.

22413. Mr. Gilson—These are Established Church?

—Yes, I believe so; newly come over to the Board.

22414. The Chairwoman—What was the date you visited the Fountain-street female and infant schools, at Belfast?—The 9th of September.

22415. How many Roman Catholic children were

returned on the rolls?—In the female school, of 143 on roll, four are Roman Catholics; taken the Rev. William Bruce, assisted, by a ladies' committee. In Fountain street Infants' school, under the same patronage, there were 174 on roll, of whom four are Catholics. In each school, the Catholic children came in during religious instruction, and are left to sit, or to go about. So far as I know and believe, there is no active instruction given to them, merely their passive presence in the school, which is a violation of the rule, there being no Certificate.

22416. Mr. Stokes.—That comes under the class of the Portadown school?—Yes.

22417. The name is the Edenderry school?—Yes. With regard to the Fountain-street school, I wish to make a remark. I spoke, to several of the Roman Catholic clergy of Belfast, wherever I found schools of this sort, and a Roman Catholic clergyman told me he visited these schools, for the purpose of looking after the juveniles of his flock, but that he could not repeat his visit. He was assailed by the children singing songs, and using offensive language which I would rather not repeat—in coarse terms that I would rather not put in evidence. The Rev. Mr. Brennan, administrator of St. Malachy's, Belfast, informed me that he visited these schools, looking after the members of his flock; he found a few Catholic children there, but the other children cried out to them, when the priest entered, "Look at your father." I asked Mr. Brennan was this meant in the literal, and natural, or only in the spiritual sense, and he said, "in the natural sense only." The children set up singing, "I won't be a Nun," and other songs in the school, and not wishing to give occasion for strife or to create unpleasantness, he said he should not wish to repeat his visits to a place of the sort.

22418. The Clergymen.—Were you present in this school while any religious instruction was going on?—I am not sure that I was. It does not appear in my notes, and I wish to be cautious. It does not affect the question however. I took the material notes that I wanted.

22419. How did you ascertain the children were in the school during religious instruction?—From the two teachers, mother and daughter—very respectable women.

22420. Were there any other rooms attached to the school into which the children who arrived before the religious instruction was concluded might have gone to shelter?—Yes, there were.

22421. In this case is your allegation simply confined to the presence of the Roman Catholic children in the schools?—Yes, the new rule is made imperative, which requires them to exclude Catholic children, in the absence of any Certificate from their parents.

22422. Mr. Gilson.—When did you commence this visitation?—Early in September.

22423. Will you tell me what day you left Portadown?—I left Dublin Monday, 7th September, and visited Portadown (Edenderry) school, and those in Lurgan on the 8th.

22424. When did you return?—I was just one month engaged in Ulster, apart from the time I spent in Dublin, before and after, on some business.

22425. When did you finish the northern inspection?—I finished the inspection of the north in a month.

22426. Give me the date?—Saturday night, 3rd of October, on which day I visited twelve schools, in Tyrone.

22427. You were engaged in it from the 7th of September to the 3rd of October after?—Yes, and afterwards resumed same inquiry in Dublin.

22428. You say you left Dublin on the 7th of September and returned on the 3rd of October—were you away the whole time?—The whole time, in Ulster.

22429. How many days were you actually engaged in visiting the schools?—Every day that the schools were open, and sometimes on Saturday.

22430. Were the schools open six or five days in the week?—Some of them six days, and I made inquiries even on Sundays, but not always visiting the schools.

22431. I mean visiting the schools; then there were four weeks in which you visited the schools, six days in the week, making twenty-four visiting days. Now the houses of religious instruction, what are they?—They vary.

22432. You examined the Time Tables on the walls?—In every school.

22433. Can you tell me generally or particularly the hours for religious instruction?—In some schools there is no religious instruction, in most Protestant schools the religious instruction opens the business; in Catholic schools it more generally closes it.

22434. How many are there in which there is no religious instruction?—I suppose there are twelve to twenty, chiefly evening and small schools.

22435. Ten or twelve schools in which there was no religious instruction?—I think if evening schools be included, I was in about twenty altogether that had no religious instruction—at least that number.

22436. What time was it you went to these schools?—At every hour of the whole time the schools were open.

22437. You went only during the hours of religious instruction?—I beg your pardon, you quite mistake.

22438. You went to ascertain whether children were present at religious instruction?—Not at all. That was one object, but a minor one, altogether.

22439. Did you go at other times than the times for religious instruction?—Certainly, at all times.

22440. How many schools did you go to at the times of religious instruction?—I don't think I was in more than five per cent. of the schools during the times of religious instruction. They are the exception, and not the rule.

22441. Twenty schools you say give no religious instruction?—Yes, mostly evening and factory, but also some day schools.

22442. How many schools did you visit altogether?—I visited in round numbers 300—I was either in the schools, inspecting them, visiting them, or inquired on the spot, in the locality, about that number of schools.

22443. I ask you how many schools did you visit?—Upwards of 200, and in the other sense about 300, including those that I inquired about.

22444. You visited upwards of 200—how long was your visit to each school?—It varied from a day or two to a few minutes.

22445. How many occupied a whole day?—Very few.

22446. How many?—I cannot tell you, nor is it material.

22447. I think it material, answer me?—I cannot; you ask me to answer questions, off-hand, that no one on earth could answer without more preparation than you have given to me. I will go from cover to cover, over my note book, and give you the fullest information, in detail.

22448. How many schools did you occupy an entire day visiting?—Very few.

22449. Have the goodness to tell me how many?—I will go through my notes to ascertain. I am able to say the only schools I recollect spending a whole day in are the Londonderry model schools, the Newtownards model schools, and the Belfast model schools—in which I was portions of three days.

22450. The Belfast model school?—I was there portions of three days.

22451. I want the entire?—I am giving you, in detail, the names of the schools.

22452. You tell me you were an entire day in the Belfast model school?—I was, portions of three days.

22453. Were you one entire day?—I think so, and portions of two others.

22454. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—From what hour to what hour?—From the opening on one day to the close, and on other days till long after the close.

22455. Mr. Gilson.—You say you were in the Derry and Belfast model schools. Were these the only schools in which you were an entire day?—I think they were the only set of schools to which I devoted a day exclusively.

22456. I am not speaking of a set of schools?—I

Dec. 8, 1866.  
—James Wm. Keenan,  
esq.

Dec. 3, 1868.

James Wm.  
Kearney,  
esq.

spent an entire day, from ten to three o'clock, in no individual school—that is no single department, no roll number.

22457. Then I am to take these two schools out of the 300 schools you visited?—No, it does not follow. For example, even if I did take these two sets of schools, there are six roll numbers connected with Belfast—boys', girls', infants', evening, maritime, and agricultural schools. I am not asking about the roll numbers?—But that is the question—excuse me—school, officially means roll number, with me.

22458. I asked you how many schools you visited for an entire day each, you told me Derry and Belfast model schools. I ask did you visit any other schools for an entire day?—I correct my answer, by saying I mean by "school," a "department."

22459. I mean schools in the common sense of the term—you have explained as to the Derry and Belfast model schools?—Then my answer is not correct. School, as I understand, and as I wish you to understand me, school means roll number—means "department"—then if there are boys, girls, and infants, there are three schools, though you might suppose only one. Therefore Derry model school is not a school but three schools. I did not, therefore, in this technical sense, devote an entire day to visit any one school.

22460. Did you occupy a whole day in visiting all the schools in "Derry model school"?—I did, an entire day, ten to three o'clock.

22461. Did you take an entire day in visiting all the schools in the Belfast model schools?—No entire day, because I did some work, and even in the case of the Derry schools I visited the convent schools in the evening.

22462. Did you devote an entire day to any school or sets of schools?—I did not devote an entire day.

22463. By a day I mean the usual school hours?—I did not.

22464. You could not visit "a school" when it was broken up—so I take it your day's work extended to five hours from the opening to the close?—In the strict sense you are quite right. I gave an exclusive day, in the sense in which you now put it, to no school.

22465. I don't mean a day of twenty-four hours, but a school day, from the opening of the school to the close of it—I want to know how many schools you visited, beginning at the opening of the school and taking the sets of schools?—From the time I commenced this inspection, till the time I closed it, there was no day that I was on inspection, in the sense you now state, that I did not visit more schools than one.

22466. Mr. Stobbs—When you said you visited 300 schools in your tour, did you mean roll numbers?—Roll numbers—departments, just as I have been saying throughout my evidence.

22467. Not separate institutions?—No.

22468. Mr. Gibson—I want to know how many entire days you occupied in visiting any set of roll numbers or sets of schools?—I have answered the question.

22469. Did you devote an entire day to visiting the Derry schools—to the three schools? Did you devote an entire day to the Belfast model schools? You have not told me any other school or sets of schools which you visited during school hours. How many other schools or sets of schools did you occupy a day's school hours in?—None, I did more work, each day.

22470. The *Chairman*.—With regard to the National-school school—what is the allegation you make in that case, as to infraction of rules?—The Certificate Book of religious instruction is not in the school. Of ninety-eight children on the roll, only one is a Roman Catholic, and that child attended the religious instruction, with the others. Further, there are three Protestant Dissenters in the school, and they learn the Shorter Catechism of the General Assembly, which is a violation of the rule of the Board, there being no Certificate authorizing it.

22471. Mr. Gibson—Under what manager is the school?—The Rev. Dr. Knox.

22472. The *Chairman*.—Do you allege that in this case a single Roman Catholic received religious in-

struction without the knowledge or consent of the parents, or that it received religious instruction in the absence of the proper forms in which it should have been entered?—Both one and the other. I also allege that three Protestant Dissenters—not Presbyterians—learn the Shorter Catechism of the General Assembly with a similar absence of either parental approbation or a Certificate.

22473. How did you ascertain that the single Roman Catholic in this school was receiving religious instruction contrary to the wish or knowledge of the parent?—From Alexander Erskine, the teacher, who was appointed there, in the previous month, only.

22474. Do you know how long the child had been in the school?—No.

22475. Rev. Dr. Wilson—There was no Certificate back in this school?—No.

22476. Whose duty is it to supply it?—The Board's, through the office, or through the Inspectors.

22477. Who was the Inspector in the district?—I don't know which, Mr. McIlroy's or Mr. Molloy's district, I did not inquire.

22478. Did you inquire?—I did not—not in the school. It is in either of the two.

22479. Quote the rule of the Board violated in the case of the three Protestant Dissenters learning the catechism which you have mentioned?—"Cases may occur in which the conduct of the teacher."

22480. From what are you reading?—The Minutes of the Board, Explanatory of the New Rule, 26th February, 1867. "But where the teacher and the child are both Protestants, whether of the same or of a different denomination, the dissent of the parent will not be implied—in this case, religious instruction may be given to the child, unless the parent expressly forbids it."

22481. Do you say that was violated in the case of the three Protestant children learning the catechism?—When I have done reading it, you will, Sir, and ask me—"Cases may occur in which the conduct of the teacher, although not coming within the strict letter of the new rule, is obviously contrary to the general spirit of the National system—*as*, for instance, if instruction should be given in the Catechism or Creed of a different persuasion from that of the child." Do you now desire to ask me any question?

22482. Yes—is that rule violated?—Yes; obviously.

22483. Quote again the closing words of that rule?—"As, for instance, if instruction should be given in the Catechism or Creed of a different persuasion from that of the child." The children are registered Protestant Dissenters, yet they all learn the Shorter Catechism of the General Assembly.

22484. The patron of the school is the Rev. Dr. Knox?—Yes.

22485. Is the teacher a Presbyterian?—Yes.

22486. In what way is the closing part of the rule violated by these Protestant Dissenters learning that catechism?—In being taught the Catechism or creed of a different persuasion from that of the children.

22487. Is the catechism to which you have referred a catechism not received by Protestant Dissenters?—I cannot say, nor will I go into that question.

22488. Is the creed of these Protestant Dissenters different from the creed of the Presbyterians?—It is so entered in the National School Register.

22489. Are you aware that is not a Presbyterian catechism?—That may be. I have given the usual Bible.

22490. Are you aware it is a catechism compiled by Protestants of different denominations?—That may be. Inform the National Board of their agreement.

22491. That Independents learn it—that Baptists learn it?—That they are made to learn it, I now repeat.

22492. That the Wesleyan Methodists have would of a new catechism on the basis of that catechism?—That may be.

22493. Does that alter your view?—Not at all.

22494. Should I understand you to say the Roman Catholic child was receiving religious instruction contrary to the wish of the parent?—Yes.

22495. Were you told in so many words?—No. I



asked the teacher whether he had authority from the parent, and he said not.

22498. Did you not say that Alex. Erskine informed you the child was receiving instruction contrary to the wish of the parents?—I cannot say he did.

22497. Do you adhere to those words?—Not at all, I simply say that the teacher told me he had had no relation whatever with the parents of that child, and therefore the rule was violated in the absence of this—and even if he had authority, it should have been given in the official Scriptures of the school, the Certificate Book, under the hand of the parent.

22498. Mr. Sullivan.—The teacher told you he had no authority?—That he had no communication with, or interview with the parent, therefore he cannot have had his authority. That is a violation of the rule—and next, even if he had had that authority, it should have been recorded in the Certificate book, no copy of which was in the school.

22499. Then your statement with regard to that school is twofold—first, that the children were receiving instruction without the authority of the parent, and next, that there was no register of approval kept?—Yes.

22500. The Chairman.—Was that paper you quoted from, strictly speaking, a rule of the Board, or an extract from a circular letter?—A Circular Minute, more important, perhaps, than a Rule, for it is explanatory of the rule, and a copy of it was sent to every school in the kingdom.

22501. Mr. Sullivan.—That accompanies the Certificate Book of Religious Instruction?—I should say it does, now.

22502. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—How long was that Roman Catholic child in the school?—I cannot say.

22503. Did you inquire?—No.

22504. Had you reason to believe the child was at the school previous to Erskine's appointment, as teacher?—I cannot say.

22505. Did it not occur to you to make inquiry, on that point, in a special case?—No, I confined myself, strictly, to the fact that the child's name was on the roll, that he was in attendance, and present at religious instruction, without a Certificate.

22506. Did you ask the teacher if he had found the child attending religious instruction when he took charge of the school?—I cannot charge my memory about that, it does not appear on my notes.

22507. Have you not stated that Erskine was a newly appointed teacher?—I have. He was appointed the 3rd of August, 1868, and I visited the school 28th September.

22508. The Chairman.—What did you find on visiting Ballynacorney school?—On the roll of the school 243 pupils, of whom six are Roman Catholics. I found no entries in Certificate Book. The teacher, Mr. Ferguson, informs me that one or two of the Catholic children, who are able to read, are sent out, during religious instruction, which would be a compliance with the rule, but that the rest are allowed to remain. I forced the Head Inspector, Mr. Fleming, had visited the school a little before, and it is his special business to see whether the inspection, by the District Inspector, is efficiently done or not. Yet the teacher distinctly states that Mr. Fleming never asked to see the Certificate Book, and never asked a question, with regard to the operation of the new rule.

22509. Mr. Wilson.—Who is the patron of the school?—I did not look who is the patron. Mr. McClure, M.P., built it. It is one of the many excellent schools built by Mr. McClure, that lie along the road from Belfast to Hollywood. It is beside Mount Potlough, a rising suburb of Belfast.

22510. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Did you ask for this Certificate Book?—Yes.

22511. Had you any right to see it?—No.

22512. It is not intended for the public?—No, but the public may see it.

22513. What is the religious denomination of Mr. McDermott, the District Inspector?—Catholic.

22514. What is the religious denomination of Mr.

Fleming, the Head Inspector?—He is registered as a Catholic.

22515. How do you know that Mr. Fleming did not examine the book, when there?—I have distinctly set forth on my notes, on the authority of the teacher, that Mr. Fleming did not see it, nor ask a question about it.

22516. Had not Mr. Fleming full access to all the books in the school?—Certainly.

22517. Could he not examine all the books without consulting the teacher?—He could, but not without his knowledge.

22518. I refer to the books in the teacher's desk?—The teacher distinctly tells me that Mr. Fleming never asked a question on the subject of the new rule or its working.

22519. Could he not see the books without asking the teacher?—Of course, he could.

22520. Mr. Sullivan.—When the Inspector visits the school, is it usual to open the desk of the teacher, and examine the books, without asking a question of him?—Not at all. It would be a piece of rudeness. The Inspector introduces himself, if his first visit, and the teacher produces the necessary books to him.

22521. Mr. Stokes.—Has the Head Inspector, on visiting the school, to fill up a particular paper or form?—No, he is merely required to enter, in the common visitors' book, the date of his visit, and the number of children he found present.

22522. Are there not particular forms of information which he has to report to the Board in Marlborough-street?—He has a printed form of note-book, in which he enters the answers, upon all these points.

22523. Does that note-book refer, in any way, to the register of parents' permissions?—I have not seen the new form of note-book, and cannot say whether it refers, in terms, to the Certificate Book, but it must refer to it, in spirit. He is asked, particularly, whether the rules are observed or not. It is a special portion of the Head Inspector's duties, and must be so, particularly as to the new rule. The teacher is required to hand, to every Inspector, on each occasion of his visit, this Certificate Book for examination. My evidence goes to show that the Board does not afford protection, under the rule, to inspectors, when the inspection is of this very loose character.

22524. The Chairman.—What have you to state as to the New Road school?—That, at the date of my visit, there were on the roll 208 children.

22525. What date?—The 24th of September.

22526. How many Roman Catholics?—Four of the 208 were Roman Catholics.

22527. What is your allegation in this case?—That these four Roman Catholics were not sent out of the school, during the time of religious instruction, but allowed to remain, contrary to the rule.

22528. Were they boys or girls?—I cannot say which. It was a mixed school. The master, Arthur Black, told me they were sent out, as required by the rule. His assistant, Margaret Woods, and she leaves them in, that they are not sent out, but that she puts them to settle caps and do other things about the school, during religious instruction, and until it is over. But, on bringing master and assistant together, the master stated he was not aware of the practice of his assistant.

22529. What children did you find in the Killaghey school?—But one Roman Catholic on the roll, at the time, but I found three Catholics, and the teacher admits, distinctly, that he canvassed, and asked the parents. And where inspection would be useful in checking serious irregularity, as in Donaghadee, No. 3 school, in the other part of this parish, inspection failed; whilst here, where the Inspector had done his duty, and cancelled an irregular Certificate, his action was neutralised, because the teacher did not carry it out. Thus, six weeks had elapsed, and the child continued nevertheless—and on the day of my visit, was present during religious instruction, and taught in the Authorized Version, before my face, in the school.

22530. Had this child, of whom you speak, got a Certificate for partaking of religious instruction?—

Dec 8, 1868.

James Wm. Keene,  
Esq.

Dec. 5, 1875.

James Wm  
Kearney,  
esq.

Through the mother, to receive religious instruction; the Inspector finding, however, that this was illegal, not being from the father—the legal parent—he cancelled it, and wrote across it, “cancelled Certificate, not being from the father.”

22531. Then do you represent that subsequently to that Certificate having been cancelled, no other had been got from the father?—No inquiry, whatever, was made, nor should there be, for, that instant, the teacher was bound to put out the child, there being no Certificate. There was then no authorisation; the date the Certificate was cancelled the teacher should have put out the child. Yet for six weeks, between the Inspector cancelling the Certificate and my visit, the child continued to attend—and was undergoing religious instruction before me, while I was in the room. On questioning the master, as to this irregularity, filled with honest indignation, he said:—“I never put out a child, in my life, though I have been seven and thirty years under the Board, and never will.”

22532. Am I to understand you as stating that no certificate from the father had been got subsequent to the Inspector cancelling the one from the mother?—None; there was no other obtained.

22533. Mr. Gáeson.—Was the father alive?—So I heard.

22534. Rev. Dr. W’heeler.—Is he alive or not?—I cannot say.

22535. Did you inquire?—I conclude, from the grounds of cancelling the Certificate, and also from my notes, that he must have been alive, at my visit.

22536. Mr. Sullivan.—Is it necessary you should inquire to establish that infraction of the rule?—Not at all. The violation is independent of that fact.

22537. Rev. Dr. W’heeler.—Was there a violation of the rule in the mother having signed the Certificate instead of the father? Read the portion of the rule applying to that.—

“In case a Parent or Guardian should wish his Child to receive religious instruction, from a Teacher who is of a different religious denomination from the Child, or from a Teacher who gives any religious instruction different from that which is in accordance with the creed of the Child, the following Certificate is to be made by each Parent or Guardian.”

22538. Do you regard the mother as a parent?—Yes.

22539. Has the Inspector, under the rules of the Board, the power of cancelling the certificate?—Certainly.

22540. Read the rule?—“Certificate of Inspector” at the foot of every individual Certificate in Book, “I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have examined the Certificate of ———, and also of the Teacher ———, above set forth, and that I am satisfied as to the genuineness of each.

Signature of Inspector ———.

Dated ——— day of ———, 18——.”

22541. Do you say that by what you have read the Inspector has a power of cancelling the Certificate?—Certainly.

22542. Is it not the duty of the Inspector strictly to report the violation of the rule to the Board?—It is; but the Inspector has an earlier duty to do. Allow me to state—

22543. Must not all the action in the case be taken by the Board?—Not at all.

22544. Mr. Stokes.—What do you think the Inspector, being a rational being, would do, on finding the Certificate not regular?—He would withhold his signature, to say the least; and the fact of his withholding his signature deprives the Certificate of authority, the Teacher’s signature being merely temporary and provisional, pending the visit of the Inspector; it is the visit of the Inspector that gives validity to the Certificate.

22545. Would he not, finding it wrong, cancel it?—Certainly, as was done in this instance.

22546. Mr. Sullivan.—Any Certificate, dating from before the visit of the Inspector, and not signed by the Inspector at that visit, is not that Certificate, by the rules of the Board, invalid?—Presumptively—

the authentication is only temporary and provisional, until the Inspector comes to inquire into the legal *fact* character of the signature, including the parent’s legal power, and his entire comprehension of the act done.

22547. Rev. Dr. W’heeler.—You said the teacher admitted, distinctly, he cancelled the parent?—Certainly.

22548. Did he use the word “cancelled”?—Asked them?—were the words.

22549. Is the statement you gave in evidence just now, true or not?—Certainly; quite true.

22550. Have you not acknowledged he used the word cancelled?—I never said he used “the word” cancelled. He said he asked them. I have, on the face of my notes, “Asked them.” The word “cancelled,” from the beginning, is mine, descriptive of substitution.

22551. Have you not distinctly stated that the teacher distinctly said “he admitted he cancelled”?—I have said it, and correctly; I meant the same as asking.

22552. Why do you put words into the mouth of the teacher, that he did not use?—I may say six or half a dozen, indifferently.

22553. Mr. Deane.—Are you aware of what becomes of the other Roman Catholic pupils that had been in attendance at the school; whether they went into another school in the neighbourhood, or what became of them?—I have nothing, on my notes, about them.

22554. Do you know whether there was a school under Roman Catholic management within reach?—There was not. In no part of Ireland did I find the Roman Catholic element weaker than along there—in, and about Donaghadee—along the coast, by Millisle, opposite Scotland, and, onwards, towards Newtownards, and Lough Swarford. There are not Catholics enough to form a school in any of the rural districts, but there are nearly enough in Donaghadee, where, doubtless, a Catholic school will soon be established.

22555. The *Gáeson*.—Are there any other violations of the rule which you have not already commented, respecting any of these schools?—Several, but I will take one, if you please, where a Certificate was forged, in Donaghadee, No. 3 school, Roll No. 8733; Patron, the Rev. Wm. Skelly, Presbyterian minister; teacher, John Milliken, Presbyterian, visited the 25th September. I found eighty-one pupils on roll, of whom five were Roman Catholics.

22556. What did you discover as regards the Certificate?—I found, from the third Certificate in the Book, Mary McVey, the mother of Mary McVey, certifying her daughter that her daughter Mary shall read the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures. This Certificate, purporting to be signed by this woman, Mary McVey, is really signed by the teacher, Milliken. On examining the Certificate, I asked the teacher, “Did Mary McVey, the mother of this child, write that,” pointing to the signature. He said “Yes.” “Did you read the Rule, below, to which your own name is attached, and explain it to her?” “I did.” “Where?” “In this school.” “I had no doubt, whatever, that her name was written by the teacher. I looked through the Report book, the Register, and the other books, and from his handwriting, I had no manner of doubt of the fact, but I was not about to convict the man on presumptive evidence of that sort. I said:—“In this girl, Mary McVey, here to-day?” “Yes, sir.” “Point her out to me, quietly, in the school.” He did so. “I want this child to come away with me, for a while.” “Yes,” I said, “My child, where do you live?” “Down the town.” “Is it far away?” “No.” “Is your father at home?” “No, he is working in the beach field.” “Is your mother at home?” “She is.” I took the child by the hand, went to the house, found the woman in, and down, and questioned her as to her children and the school. “Can you read or write, Mrs. McVey?” “No.” “Was any book sent to you, in the school, by Mr. Milliken?” “No.” “Did you give Mr. Milliken any authority to put your name to any writing?” “No.” “Will you be good enough to come down with me to the school?” I told her I was inquiring into how the Catholic children are doing in the schools, telling her frankly who I was, and the object I

had in view. She at once said she would come with us. We went down to the school. I told her, on the way, that she was not to speak disrespectfully to the teacher, and to be perfectly quiet and well behaved. I went in to the master. It was play hour. I said to him, "It is better to leave the children out at play," which he did. There were then no persons in the room but the teacher, the woman, Mr. Vey, and myself. I had warned the master of the serious nature of the inquiry, and to be very cautious what he would say—that I was about to give evidence, on the matter, before the Royal Commission. I inevitably stated that, whenever I saw a necessity—for I am incapable of representing that I was this that or the other—simply that I was a witness before the Royal Commission, having volunteered a motion with regard to it. "Mrs. Mr. Vey, can you read or not?" "No, sir." "Did you sign that paper there, with your name to it?" "No, sir." "Was this book read to you?" "No, sir. I never saw or heard of that book till this moment." I then wrote across it—"I, Mary Mr. Vey, hereby certify that I never saw this book, never heard of this book, never signed this book, nor authorized anyone else to sign it, on my behalf." I then got the teacher to read the statement to Mary Mr. Vey that I had written, and I signed it. "Jan. W. Kavanagh," put the date, 25th September, 1863, and made her affix her mark to it; and that document remains in the book, as Certificate No. 3. I then took one of the last blank leaves of the Certificate Book, which I made the master remove, having first made a complete transcript on it of the Certificate of Mrs. Mr. Vey. At the bottom of the copy, I got the master to sign "I am the so and so Milliken, above referred to." I will put this in evidence. I cannot give it in to-day. I could not find the copy this morning. The teacher removed the leaf with a penknife.

22555 Mr. O'Brien—The man himself confessed the signature was not her handwriting, and that the statement of the woman was correct; that she never signed the book—never heard of the book!—That the master never saw it, never heard of it, never signed—and could not read or write.

22556 He stated all that was correct!—Strictly true.

22559 And he said he was the man above referred to!—Yes, and the woman signed with his mark, in his presence, after I caused the teacher himself to read my writing to her. I have further, in connection with this, to say that the Head Inspector was there the very day before my visit.

22560 Who is he?—Mr. Fleming. He remained there from eleven to two o'clock, and never asked one question, with regard to the operation of the rule.

22561 Mr. Stokes—Did the master offer any explanation?—None, whatever. He said he had misheard, and that he would not like it to be done to his own school. So that, in this case, the Head Inspector failed to discover, even to inquire into what a stranger detected in the first five minutes of my visit, and, thereby, failed to protect the minority. In the other end of the parish, Killageah school, where the Inspector did his duty, by cancelling an irregular Certificate, the teacher failed to carry it out. So that there is no protection for the minority in either case.

22562 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Did you make any representation to the priest?—Not at all, it was no business of mine. I did not go to the north of Ireland for that purpose.

22563 For what purpose did you go to the north of Ireland?—To make inquiries about these matters. Not to remedy them in any way.

22564 Was it of your own motion?—Of my own mere motion.

22565 Had you arrived at any conclusion before you entered on this work?—I had arrived at the very conclusions which my visit confirms.

22566 Whose agent were you in executing this mission?—My own.

22567 If I heard you were the agent of other parties it would not be correct!—It would not, but that is not the only insecurity, you must have heard about too.

22568 Should it be an unnecessary to say you went to the north of Ireland as the agent of the Catholic bishops?—Certainly, I was not their agent. The idea and determination to go there originated with myself.

22569 Not paid in any way for that purpose?—They sympathized in any manner, and everywhere I went amongst the bishops I got cordial thanks with regard to their own schools. That was natural—I was not going into Ulster a common stranger.

22570 Was this teacher long in charge of this school?—Only since 1867. He was only twenty years of age. He was appointed in 1867.

22571 What time in 1867?—I cannot say.

22572 Did you make any inquiry as to whether he found this child receiving religious instruction in the school when he came?—It originated within his time, and only lately, the mother told me so.

22573 Answer the question, did you learn that he found this child receiving religious instruction in the school when he came?—It was he who first brought the child under religious instruction.

22574 Do you say she was not receiving religious instruction in the school previous to his taking charge of it?—I say she was not. And the father of this child, before he went to work every day, warned the mother not to allow the child to go till eleven o'clock, till after the Bible lesson was over. The father, a strict Catholic, warned the mother to see that the child would not go till after the Bible class.

22575 Mr. Gibson—Were the father and mother of different religions?—No, both Catholics.

22576 Did you learn that the teacher himself said to the child—the child should not receive religious instruction without the consent of the mother given?—I heard no such thing.

22577 Were you told the child had said to the teacher the mother told her to attend and receive religious instruction?—I am certain the mother did not. I asked the child and mother, and I am certain the child was not told to attend to get any religious instruction.

22578 Could it be possible the teacher should have said to the child, "Let the mother come and signify her wish on the subject?"—I cannot say what might have occurred in that way.

22579 Did you hear that the mother came to the school and signified her wish that the child should receive religious instruction?—I did not hear that. I heard that a conversation had taken place with regard to it between the teacher—which aggravates the case—between the teacher and the mother. It was this the mother said—"My child has nearly the Second Book off, can't you repeat it from end to end? I don't think she is doing well in her reading." "That comes," said he, "because she is not in the best reading lessons in the school." "What is that?" said the mother "The Bible."

22580 Did the teacher say he had the Certificate filled ready to be signed by the mother?—No, he stated no such thing. Anyone could see that the handwriting in the body of the Certificate and the name were the same.

22581 Did you think yourself justified in dealing as you did with the Certificate book of the school?—Certainly. I did not remove the leaf. I was most anxious to get the schoolmaster to take his penknife, cut it out, and mark on it to what it referred.

22582 The Chairman—Are there any other chances of infraction of the rule that you have to allege with respect to schools?—Oh, yes. In several of the schools they filled the Certificate book by anticipation, but on the book being sent, or the parent brought to the school, or word sent to the parent, the parent refused to sign it. The teachers acted vicariously for the parent, were putting the signature to it for him. There are several certificates incomplete, without signature.

22583 Mr. Gibson—Was there any date put to these incomplete or unsigned certificates?—There was not, generally.

Dec 5, 1868.

James Wm. Kavanagh, Esq.

Dec. 3, 1865  
—  
James Wm.  
Kavanaugh,  
esq.

22584. The Chairman.—I suppose those cases in which the parents declined to sign the Certificates which had been previously filled up, would prove that in those instances, at least, the parents had exercised an independent judgment?—Yes.

22585 Mr. Sullivan.—What have you to say relative to Broughshane school?—In this case I connect the Patron, the Inspector, and the Teacher. The Broughshane schools are about two miles to the east of Ballymena. They are remarkable schools in the history of the Education question. The late Rev. Dr. Stewart, a distinguished Presbyterian divine, was patron of the two schools at Broughshane, and also of the celebrated Carrara mine, which led to the junction of the Synod of Ulster in 1846.

22586. What class of school is Broughshane?—Non vested.

22587. What is the general appearance of the establishment?—I was very much disappointed with regard to it. It is in a most dilapidated state, but it is a police equipped with Canon, under same patron.

22588. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you offering to meet schools than one?—Broughshane male and female.

22589. Mr. Sullivan.—Will you proceed with your statement?—In Broughshane male school, I found 101 boys on roll—of whom three were of the Established Church, 11 Catholics, and 87 Presbyterians and others. The religious instruction consists of reading and exposition of the Scriptures, also repetition of psalms and questions from ten o'clock to half past ten o'clock daily—on Saturday from ten to twelve o'clock. This last is a technical word, on many of the Ten Tables, for the questions of the Presbyterian Catechism that are assigned as a table lesson. Eleven Roman Catholics, in that school attended the entire course of religious instruction. Mr. Brown, the late Inspector, told the teacher to call on, that is, to convince the parents; the teacher called, but they refused to sign the Certificates. The teacher brought the Book to them, but they all refused.

22590. Was there no Certificate entered in the Book?—None whatever—a perfect blank—yet the children attended the whole term, ever since the Certificate Book came out—as if it was not in existence—to attend the whole course of Religious Instruction in the school, just as under the old Notice System.

22591. Mr. Gibson.—At the time of religious instruction?—At the time of Religious Instruction, daily.

22592. Mr. Sullivan.—Was the patron aware of what was going on in the school?—Yes, the Teacher told the Patron that he had convinced the parents, and even brought the book to them to their houses, to try and obtain the signatures of the Catholics, but that they all refused. He asked the patron what he was to do. Rev. Mr. Robinson, the patron, told him not to heed it; that he thought the rule was about to be changed by the General Assembly.

22593. By the General Assembly?—Yes.

22594. Not by the Board?—By the General Assembly, these are his words.

22595. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Which rule?—The new Rule of 1864, requiring Certificates.

22596. Mr. Sullivan.—Were all the Catholic children on the roll of the school supposed to be attending the religious instruction?—All, without exception.

22597. Mr. Gibson.—What was the date of your visit?—20th of September.

22598. Mr. Sullivan.—What complaint have you to make of the inspection?—I complain of Mr. Brown, for having directed the Teacher to convince the parents, and stimulate proselytizing—which it was the very object of the rule to prevent. I complain of the assistance to that same Inspector.

22599. What is his name?—Daniel M. Wilson, for never having made any inquiry on the subject, and thereby rendering perfectly useless, the protective action of this new rule—leaving the Catholic children in the same state they were in, under the old Notice System.

22600. Have you any reason to suppose the new Inspector was acquainted with the act of his predecessor?—I cannot say. It is very near, only two miles

from Ballymena, his residence; and on the 3rd of March, 8th of April, and 24th of July, 1865, Mr. Wilson visited; while in the years 1866 and 1867 Mr. Brown made as many as eleven visits; yet the whole inspection visits, by both Inspectors, failed to give any protection to the Catholics miserably.

22601. That is a case in which the teacher, the Inspector, and the patron are engaged?—Yes, all are constantly showing that the rule is a perfect nullity, a thorough sham; a sham still worse than the Notice System, which it was devised to correct.

22602. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is your reference to the male or female school?—To the male.

22603. Mr. Gibson.—You used the word “convince” as your interpretation of what was done?—I always do so, adversely. None of the teachers, I may say, once for all, used the word to me. I use the word.

22604. As your simple?—Description.

22605. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In what capacity did you represent yourself when you visited the school?—As a visitor, merely, on my entrance.

22606. Could you not have represented yourself as either a Royal Commissioner or one of the Assistant Commissioners sent by the Royal Commission to visit the school?—I am utterly incapable of making any misrepresentation as to who I am. A Royal Commissioner I am known not to be, and the office of Assistant Commissioner I would not hold.

22607. Mr. Gibson.—Will you answer the question—Do you say no?—Never, there or anywhere else, and I particularly request that you not ask the question again.

22608. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Were you alone on your visits to these schools?—No; I was accompanied, that day, by the parish priest of Ballymena.

22609. Have you any reason to believe he could have represented you as a Royal Commissioner, or as sent by the Royal Commission to gain information?—I believe him to be incapable of stating a falsehood, or of being disrespectful to me, in such a matter.

22610. I submit here, my lord, two affidavits signed by the teachers of the Broughshane schools, and forwarded to me unaltered, without my knowing anything of it—forwarded to me by the patron of the school, during our late series of sittings. Where—You will please to give me the affidavits to read.

22611. I want to have them read. Witness—I will read them, with great pleasure.

22612. What is the name of the teacher of this school?—Edward Davidson, trained in 1865, classed second division of second class; a Presbyterian.

22613. I had in view merely the affidavit of the teacher of the male school. Witness—You will please allow me to read them, that I may be examined on them.

[The affidavit is read by one of the Secretaries as follows:—]

“Petty Sessions (Ireland) Act, 1851, 14 & 15 Vic., cap. 35.

(Form A. d.) Solemn Declaration

Complainant } Petty Sessions District of

Defendant } County of

I, EDWARD DAVIDSON, teacher of Broughshane Male National School, do solemnly and sincerely declare that on the 20th of September, 1865, about the hour of twelve o'clock in the day, a person in the appearance of a gentleman, accompanied by Priest Lynch, of Ballymena, and signing himself “James W. Kavanaugh,” visited the Broughshane Male National School, and that he either said to me, or to the Committee of the Board of Primary Education, or that he was delegated by the Commissioners of Primary Education to obtain information for them. I cannot remember which of these two things he said, but I declare (sic) that he said one of them, and that owing to this representation of himself, my time was taken up and the business of the school interfered with in a manner which I should not have allowed. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of an Act passed in the sixth year of the reign of his late Majesty King William IV., chapter 62, for the abolition of unnecessary oaths.

(Signed), EDWARD DAVIDSON

Made and subscribed before me, the 27th day of October, in the year 1865.

(Signed), ALEX. DAVIES,  
Justice of said County.

22614. The *Gleaner*.—Can you explain how you could have conveyed to the teacher the impression that you were employed by this Commission to make inquiries?—I could not explain an absurdity—an impossibility. No one could, my lord. Neither in this, nor in any other school, nor anywhere, have I ever said or done anything to warrant such an impression or opinion.

22615 Mr. Stokes.—Do you not think that as the teacher undertook the manager of the school to say that the rule as to religious instruction was about to be changed by the General Assembly, when probably the statement made by the manager was that it would be done through the influence of the General Assembly, in the same way he misunderstood what you said about being a witness before this Commission and misinterpreted your words as signifying you were a member of the Commission?—I don't attempt to explain it. With regard to the first part of the statement, I understood the man to say—not that the General Assembly was going to make the change, but that it would be made through their influence. Nothing occurred, there or elsewhere, since this Commission was appointed, that would lead any human being to suppose I had any connection, whatever, of an official character, with the Commission. On the contrary, any allusion made to it was that I was a thoroughly independent witness—in, I trust, I have proved myself—having no connection with the Commission, but as a voluntary witness, for the Catholics of Ireland. It is impossible I could have said anything warranting language of that sort, used by the teacher.

22616 Mr. Sullivan.—May you have said that you intended to bring matters connected with these schools before the Royal Commission?—In the most explicit terms, I told the man, that my object was to see the working of certain schools in the north of Ireland, with a view to bring it before the Royal Commissioners—I stated it.

22617 Are you not known to Presbyterian teachers in the north of Ireland as an avowed enemy of the system?—Everywhere, I hope.

22618 Is it not perfectly well known, consequently, that your relations either to the National Board or to this Commission are of a kind that could not lead to such a mistake?—No one in Ireland who knows anything of the subject, could make such a mistake about me.

22619 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—How long is it since you ceased to act as an Inspector of the Board?—Ten years and upwards.

22620 How long is it since, as an Inspector, you visited the north of Ireland?—My last visit was in 1837.

22621 Did you ever meet this Davidson as a teacher in a school in the course of your inspection?—No. I understood, so far as I recollect, that he had seen me in Dublin. And from the very fact of the trained teachers through Ireland, spending some time in Dublin, and I being pointed out, passing and re-passing through Marlborough-street, when visiting the schools—recollect I have gone there frequently—there are very few men better known to the National teachers, although I am ten years disconnected. Almost all the trained teachers know me.

22622 Do you undertake to swear that all the teachers trained in Marlborough-street know you from your occasional visits?—I did not say that.

22623 Do you undertake to say that Davidson knew you?—No; but I undertake to say that he told me, on visiting his school, that he had seen me in Dublin.

22624 When the moment you went in?—No, after a little time, he said so.

22625 Was it when you brought yourself to his knowledge?—No, incidentally as I went along. He said, "I saw you in Dublin." Before I was many days in Belfast, my visit and its object were known all through the whole town, and in the adjoining counties. Mr. Mallory, the Inspector, met me at the train, in Corkmore, and said he followed me through the schools, and asked me did I find many abuses.

22626 In reference to this school, did you say to the teacher that he should take the Roman Catholic

children by the neck and put them out?—I don't say I did, and I am sure I have done so, in some cases, in order to express, strongly, the obligation of the rule—"put them out by the neck"—it is a very common expression, bodily and corporally. It is very hard, of course, for conscientious Presbyterians to do that.

22627 You inquired whether the Inspector, at his last visit, asked for the religious instruction certificate book?—Certainly.

22628 What did the teacher say?—He told me that Mr. Wilson, his Inspector, had never asked for it.

22629 Could the Inspector have seen such a book without asking for it?—He could, but, in so small a room, not without the teacher knowing that he had seen it.

22630 Do you adhere to your former statement that it would be regarded by any teacher as rude on the part of the Inspector or other officer of the Board to go to the desk without asking the teacher for the books?—Except the teacher was by. The usual and proper mode is to salute the teacher, introduce yourself, go to the desk, and get the necessary books in his presence.

22631 As a matter of fact are not the Inspectors usually well acquainted with their teachers?—In due time. They are not gifted with a higher degree of second sight than anyone else.

22632 Are you aware of it as a fact that they don't usually ask the teacher for the books, but go and take them?—That depends on facts. If the Inspector was long in the district he might do so; but that cannot apply to Daniel M. Wilson, who came there this year.

22633 In that case, how can the teacher tell whether he has looked at the book or not?—The rule of the Board requires that the teacher shall submit the Certificate Book to the Inspector, so often as he visits the school, and that rule was violated three times, this year, in the case of Daniel M. Wilson.

22634 Are you aware the teachers to whom you refer regard with indignation the change you make against them of examining?—I am perfectly indifferent, in what light they regard it.

22635 Are the parents in the habit of coming to the schools with their children?—Rarely, and only in the first instance, if they come at all.

22636 Is it not difficult for the teachers to get the necessary information even for registering?—In cases of mixed marriages there is a difficulty, but not if the children have brothers or sisters already at school.

22637 Who is the responsible party to register—parent or teacher?—The parent, but the teacher can do it if he knows the exact home brothers or sisters of the child having been there before, and that there is no conflict about mixed marriages or otherwise.

22638 Did you think of calling on the patron of this school to see what explanation he would give?—I would no more think of calling on him than of calling on the Inspector, Mr. Wilson, on the subject. That was the business of the Inspector—not mine.

22639 Should you regard the patron of this school as a gentleman who would honestly and faithfully carry out the views of the Board?—I know nothing whatever about him, except his name being on paper, before me, as Rev. A. Robinson, Presbytery minister, Beelaghmore.

22640 Should you be surprised to learn that in a communication addressed to me on the 28th of October, when we were last sitting, the patron should say this—

"I beg to say that I repudiate with indignation and even the intimation of this gentleman, that I or any teacher under me ever attempted to kidnap any pupil. For first, as you I have been manager of some seven National schools. In many things I have been decidedly wrong, this, however, I can safely say, that while my schools have been mixed in the town and fallow space of that town, I have never attempted to interfere with the religious views of any Roman Catholic or Episcopalian child. Roman Catholics here could and would testify that they have no fear of the children being tempted with any of my schools. In all good faith I have endeavored to carry out the new rule of the National Commissioners regarding religious instruction. I am a member of our Church's Committee on Primary Educa-

Dec. 3, 1865.  
James Wm.  
Kearney,  
esq.

tion, and I can prove that I was one of those who took no objection to the new rule of the Commissioners. I held, on the contrary, that it was in essence inconsistent with the original idea of the National system, viz., united moral and secular and separate religious instruction. I have told my teachers that if any parent objected to his child receiving religious instruction they should put that child out of school during the time of such instruction, even though the child should desire to remain, and I have given as my reason that I would not in any way encourage parental disobedience. I may say, besides, that I am not aware of any Roman Catholic child who had been at any of the National schools under any care, leaving the Roman Catholic faith and joining any Church. I have heard, and I think that it could easily be proved that not a few Roman Catholic children who had been taught in the denominational schools of the Church Extension Society, have left the Roman Catholic faith, and are now solemnly, at least, in connection with the Church of England. Presbyterians and Roman Catholics are living here in unity, if not all, the symptoms of social, and I might add, Christian brotherhood. This result might be traced to a variety of causes, but most certainly one of them, and not the least influential, is the mixed system of National education.

"I have heard that exemption has been taken to teachers calling upon Roman Catholic parents, and inquiring if they would or would not object to their children attending the religious instruction. Now it ought to be borne in mind that the teachers did so only in the case of those children of Roman Catholics who previous to the introduction of the new rule were attending their schools and receiving work, at least the merit, if not the expressed consent of their parents, religious instruction. These parents knew nothing of the introduction of the new rule—it was necessary to inform them of it. To have expelled the children from a religious instruction that hitherto they had been attending with the consent of their parents, and which still the parents might desire them to attend, would have been a proceeding as harsh as unjustifiable. The teacher in going to the parents and acquainting them with the new rule, and asking them if they desired their children to attend or to desert themselves from religious instruction adopted at once the moral and rational course."

Hearing read that portion of a letter, dated 28th October, does it induce you to modify your statement?—It makes the case much worse, most of it is so contrary to fact—on I undertake to show.

22641. Mr. Sullivan.—Before you do so, I will ask you did you use the word "kidnap" at any time?—Never.

22642. In that letter, does he not give an interpretation of the rule of the Board, according to the old rule, and not according to the new one?—Clearly. The interpretation of the Board is that the dissent of the parent is required, whereas he takes it that the parent must expressly object.

22643. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In this letter does he not specifically refer to the new rule?—Yes; but he both misapprehends and misrepresents it, if he knew the words of the rule.

22644. Mr. Sullivan.—In his description of the rule does he not show the old rule and not the new rule?—Certainly. The moment he got the Certificate Book and the explanation he was bound to tell the teacher to send the Catholic children out of the school.

22645. Have you any other observation to make on that letter?—He says it is the happiest example of mixed education, that is, Catholics taught in Presbyterian schools by Presbyterian teachers, not merely secular instruction, but that they have their faith intensified with, taught in a religion hostile to their own, at the expense of Catholic missionaries. That is the happiest example of mixed education, according to Rev. Mr. Robinson. He says, many social sciences, the work of mixed education, exist in that neighbourhood into which military had to be brought but a few years ago, in order to save the lives of Tipperary men, Catholics, who were working there, on the railway.

22646. The Chairman.—Was the ordinary business of the school suspended for any time at Carrick?—No.

22647. Was the Rev. Mr. Lynch present with you at Carrick as well as at Broughshane?—Yes, because he is parish priest of the place.

22648. Was the mistress at Carrick in any way

obliged to show to you the book in which the Inspector makes his observations?—Not to me. I did not see it nor ask for it.

22649. Did you not see the Inspector's observation book at Carrick?—No. I heard the Rev. Mr. Lynch ask for it. The teacher objected to give it. I told the Rev. Mr. Lynch, in an under tone, that he had no authority to demand it. He said he would ask for it. I said I can be no party to that. So the inquiry went on. The priest asked, "Where is the Observation Book?—I don't see it on the desk?" "It is in my own house." "Well, if your house is not far away, you might go for it." She went for the Observation Book but failed to bring it. I had no connection whatever, with the matter. During the whole time, I was guarded against violating the rules of the Board, which would have been a special want of good taste on my part, so that I never asked a question, but one I was entitled, by the rules, to ask.

22650. Mr. Wilson.—Do you say you never violated any rule of the Board?—I do.

22651. Let me read this rule to you. It is in the Regulations of 1866:—

"As the religious instruction of the children given in the school-room is under the control of the clergyman or lay person committing it with the approbation of his parents, the Commissioners can give no liberty to any visitor, whether clergyman or other person, to interfere therewith or to be present thereat."

Did you violate that rule?—Certainly not. I was never present at religious instruction, unless with the express permission of the teacher giving the instruction.

22652. Has the teacher any right to allow any person to be present?—He has. I gave no religious instruction in the school in Portlawn. I merely heard the Bible class on the invitation of the teacher, the same as any other intellectual lesson.

22653. The Chairman.—Was that examination of the Bible class an examination that could be conducted according to the rules of the Board during the time of secular instruction?—Certainly.

22654. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What were they reading?—One of the books of the Pentateuch, and I examined them on history and geography only.

22655. Mr. Wilson.—During religious instruction?—Yes.

22656. And you, being neither manager nor teacher, made that the occasion for secular instruction?—It was a secular portion of religious instruction.

22657. What right had you or the teacher to alter the order?—The teacher being the person giving religious instruction gave me permission to remain at the desk and confine my inquiries examining the stations of the school, and that is the meaning of being present during religious instruction.

22658. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should the teacher, being a Protestant, not have thought it strange, knowing your religious denomination, that you should take part in religious instruction?—He knew perfectly well my religion.

22659. The Chairman.—In either of these schools, Broughshane or Carrick, was the mistress threatened to be reported when she declined to produce the Inspector's Observation Book?—Not by me, nor in my hearing or presence. Nor do I believe she was. It could apply only to the Rev. Mr. Lynch. It cannot apply to me, from what I have said. I told the Rev. Mr. Lynch he had no authority whatever to get the book. I don't think, after hearing this, that the Rev. Mr. Lynch would make use of any threat of the sort. That I did not do it is certain, for I did not ask it. That I did not hear it is equally certain, and further—I disavow it, for the reasons I have assigned.

22660. Was any charge made publicly in this school that the managers and teachers were violating the rule of the Board?—I stated to each of the teachers in each and every instance where I found a violation of rule, what it was, and the extent, but did it in an under tone, never stopping the business, never taking any authority upon myself, but simply saying I would report it, as a witness, to the Royal Commission.

22651. Not publicly?—Never. I am incapable of conduct of that sort. I would just as soon think of misbehaving myself in the patron's school as in his dressing-room.

22652. Did you use such an expression as this—"An end must be put to the kidnapping of Roman Catholics?"—It is not a word of mine. I don't think I ever used the word, in connection with this question.

22653. Do you consider that representations of that sort made by Mr Robinson to the National Board must have been made from enormous apprehension?—I am certain, from the nature of the case, I never used the word kidnapping. The children were in the school, passing from the Notice System to the present rules—that is not in the sense of "kidnaping." I would not apply the term. I never did, but I am sure I might apply a more odious expression.

22654. Mr Sullivan.—Have you any statement to make with regard to the Corcoran school?—There were seventy-eight children on the roll of that school, of whom there were Roman Catholics, and after twenty-one years' operation this is the condition of the mixed education of the great "Model," or typical Corcoran case. I found several Catholics, one of them a remarkable one. The parent's name was put to it by subscription, but none of the blanks in the body of the Certificate filled up, to say whether or not it was the Koran the parent authorized his children to be taught or any form of Christianity. The signature was put to a blank Certificate. It is like putting one's name on a blank bill stamp.

22655. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You read it blank?—Yes, but with the person's name attached.

22656. What was the name?—Hugh McCurry.

22657. Mr Stokes.—As some reference has been made to the happy effects of united education in the neighbourhood of Ballynema, I wish to read for you a statement made by a very respectable schoolmaster issued in that neighbourhood, and ask your opinion of what he states on that subject:—

"I think it necessary to state for the better understanding of the position of a Catholic P. T. while in a model school, that in the elementary National schools of Ireland the pupils scarcely ever get any positive instruction in religion—no explanation of prayer, sacraments, sacraments, &c., neither Catholics nor Protestant clergymen taking so much interest in the religious instruction of the pupils as I find they do in England, where they have the sole charge of their own schools. In fact, religion ceases to be a very secondary matter in the mind of the pupils, when they see little notice taken of it by their teachers or clergymen. Thus, instead of animating Catholics and Protestants more charitably disposed towards each other, makes them more inclined to religious controversy, endeavouring to make them find out the weak points in each other's creed, neither party knowing what true religion consists in—making it more a polemical study than a motive for the guidance of their actions.

"This will account for the fact that when I entered Ballynema model school in 1846, at the age of eighteen years, I was unable to explain the Lord's prayer.

"Ballynema Model School.

"The teaching-staff consisted of the master, Mr. John Givens, three Catholics, four Protestants, and one Protestant pupil teacher. The master never interfered in our religious belief. No instruction in religion whatever of any sort given to the pupil teachers—no night prayer or not as we liked. The Protestant joined with the Catholics in the master's room at night prayers. No morning prayers whatever. Two or three times I took the Catholics pupil teachers into the dining-room at night to say our prayers, but were interrupted by the others when their prayers were over, so gave it up.

"For the Catholic pupil teachers there was more than a suspicion of religious instruction, for though the master never interfered, the whole air of the place was non-Catholic. Craig said to me shortly after entering, that I was admitted because I was a 'Romanist.' First time I heard the term applied to a Catholic. Had many polemical debates with the Protestant pupil teachers, such as the 'Celibacy of the Clergy,' with 'Bentley,' the 'Infallibility of the Pope,' the 'Inspiration of the Bible,' with 'Horvath,' about 'Holy

Water,' with 'Lament.' Brought to task by Craig for studying Zoology on Sunday—he saying the Bible was the only book for that day. Protestant pupil teachers often whistled party tunes. On Ash-Wednesday, after coming from church, was asked by the school children did I get a reb with the burnt stick, running the school. The end influence counted on Catholic pupil teachers is heightened by the bigotry and prejudice of the town's people. An instance of these feelings may be gathered from a copy of a placard accompanying a sermon in one of the Presbyterian churches:—

Popery.  
A Master Invention;  
The  
Anti Church of Serpents.  
A Lecture by  
The Rev. Dr. Stewart,  
in Wellington-street Church,  
on Sabbath evening, 23rd March, 1851.

From the above it may be easily understood that when I left after the experience of my year's pupil teachership, I must have for religion than when I entered."

22658. Do the statements in that letter concur with your own information?—Entirely; and I beg to remind you that Rev. Dr. Stewart, the lecturer, was the patron of the Broughshane and Corcoran schools, an early and powerful opponent; but, since 1840, an ardent supporter of the National system.

22659. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware how many years since Dr. Stewart departed this life?—Eleven years.

22660. At what time did I understand you to say the Inspector visited the Broughshane male school from the 8th of May till October of this year?—3rd March, D. M. Wilson, 8th of April, D. M. Wilson, 24th of July, D. M. Wilson.

22661. With regard to this Corcoran school, you have said that the Rev. Mr. Lynch is the parish priest of the district. How far is Corcoran from Ballynema?—Three to four miles north-west of Ballynema.

22662. You have referred to Corcoran as not typical—at least as not a very good type of mixed education. Is the district Presbyterian or Roman Catholic?—Presbyterian, chiefly.

22663. Does it afford material for mixed education?—Not as ample as other localities.

22664. With regard to the Roman Catholic minority, how could you provide for secular instruction independently of the united system of education?—It could be provided for by a mixed system of education, but not open to the abuses I have described.

22665. You could not expect Roman Catholic children to walk to Mr. Lynch's school?—I could not.

22666. You referred to a blank certificate? Did you make special inquiries regarding that?—The name McCurry was inserted.

22667. When his children came to the school did anyone come with them?—I cannot say.

22668. Did you inquire?—No.

22669. Did you learn that they entered themselves as Presbyterians?—No. They are on my notes as Catholics.

22670. And that the teacher discovered the mistake and sent for the father—did you learn that?—No.

22671. Did you learn that on the 5th of September he signed a blank certificate, with a mark, to save trouble of coming back, saying to the teacher not to fill it up till he would think over it and send her word?—I heard he said he was not prepared then to say what he would have then taught. Under these circumstances it is perfectly clear he ought not have been asked to sign the document, the body of which was not filled up.

22672. Was he asked to sign?—He must have been. It was signed.

22673. Did he not subsequently give authority for it to be filled up?—I know nothing whatever of that. It was blank when I visited on the 25th of September.

22674. Should you be surprised to learn that the very next day he gave the authority to fill up the certificate?—How could it surprise me, when, as you say, it occurred after my visit?

Dec. 3, 1858.

James Wm. Lavagh,  
Esq.

Dec. 3, 1866

James Wm.  
Esmonde,  
esq.

22685. Had you no part in ordering the teacher to get the observation book?—None.

22686. Where was it?—I heard her state it was in her house.

22687. Did she assign any reason for its being there?—The school was in such a wretched condition from rain. It was worse than some of the most wretched schools I ever visited in the poorest part of Connaught.

22688. Mr. Swales.—Is this the famous Corcoran school?—Yes. The rain pouring down, tablets nailed or pinned to the wall. Some windows built up and the shutters permanently closed, the glass being broken. Further, it did not bear an inscription. I don't know whether the Inspector, Mr. Wilson, reported that or not.

22689. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Did you make any inquiry?—I could not make inquiry. You don't mean to say I am to call to Marlborough-street, and ask to see his report?

22690. Mr. Swales.—Was there no inscription?—A tradition of it. The board, or the lower half of the board that bore the inscription, only remained.

22691. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—After the testimony you have given of the Inspector, I suppose you should not be surprised to learn that he reported on the school in May, that it was badly supplied with requisites, and that there was no inscription on it?—I am very happy to hear that he did.

22692. Did the teacher go for the observation book?—She did.

22693. Did she bring it back?—I think not.

22694. Did she assign a reason?—She said the box or something or other was locked. She was a rough poor woman, deformed, wanting her right hand, and in wretched circumstances, and I did not like to see her put about.

22695. Should it be true that she was spoken to roughly on that occasion by either you or Mr. Lynch?—I have already stated that I never spoke roughly to any teacher. I did not speak roughly to her, on the contrary, I felt deeply for her. I never demanded the Inspector's Observation Book since I left the Board's service, except on the Catholic patron's authority. I had made friends with those schools.

22696. Did you or Mr. Lynch interrupt the school by putting questions?—I did not.

22697. Did he?—He did; but only by asking the children as to their supply of books.

22698. Did the teacher remonstrate?—The teacher said something against it. He asked the children whether the books were their own or not, in order to see the extent to which the school was supplied with books, finishing up the observation and sharpness on the part of Mr. Wilson, Inspector, with regard to his own National schools in this respect.

22699. Did the teacher say that if Mr. Lynch interfered in any way further, she would report it to the Board?—I did not hear it, but she might have said it.

22700. Mr. Swales.—What salary did the teacher in Corcoran get?—She has £20 a year from the Board. The fees amount to £3 in 3d. The centre keeps a night school that the young men and boys and servants in the neighbourhood attend, from seven till nine o'clock two nights in the week, for one penny a week each.

22701. How day school is a mixed school?—Yes, she is rough in her manner, and her qualifications are of the very humblest kind.

22702. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it not in a very remote district?—It overlooks one of the richest valleys, that of the Board, in Ireland. You being a native of the place, I commend you upon the cultivated and affable appearance of the neighbourhood.

22703. Mr. Dewe.—Was the Rev. Mr. Lynch in the habit of visiting this school?—I think he was accustomed to go there. He and I were old acquaintances. He has been connected with the Board since its foundation, and is one of the best informed gentlemen on the subject in the province of Ulster. I am sorry the Commission has not had the benefit of his important evidence.

22704. Has he schools under his own patronage?—Five in the town of Ballymena, and Ceshally, Ball No. 8, a vested school.

22705. Any within reach of the Catholic children attending the Corcoran school?—No. In Broughshane a hundred refusals, or rather hesitations to grant a site for payment, for the education of his children; Mr. Lynch is trying to get up another school there.

22706. Is there a sufficient number of Roman Catholics for a school?—Scarcely. When I visited Ballymena in 1858, Mr. Lynch had a little struggling school, not having an attendance sufficient to warrant a grant. In 1858, instead of having no National school, I found a slated house with two admirable schools just by his church, and he has three other schools in Harryville, all of their own kind, as to fabric, style, and fittings, not inferior to the district model schools. They cost him £1,800.

22707. Are his schools attended exclusively by Roman Catholics?—Exclusively, and just beside them Presbyterian schools attended exclusively by Episcopalian and Presbyterian. Mixed education is totally disappearing. It is a mere question of time until we see the last of it.

22708. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I understand you to have just said that all the other schools in Ballymena are mixed—did you say that?—I said that just by Rev. Mr. Lynch's schools, at Harryville, are Presbyterian schools, that may be said to be mixed.

22709. Do you know how many schools there are in the town of Ballymena connected with the National system?—I think I do.

22710. How many?—Guy's, three, the Rev. Mr. Lynch has five National schools, Harryville (two Presbyterian), three model, and the workhouse—fourteen in all, and all visited by me.

22711. Exclusive of Mr. Lynch's?—Nine, exclusive of the Rev. Mr. Lynch's.

22712. Are there not nine, including the three departments of the model school?—There are.

22713. Are you not aware they are mixed schools?—There are nine, including the workhouse. I was there too. Some only are mixed, and very sparingly so.

22714. Are they not all mixed schools, with most denominations than one?—There is no mixed school—no substantial mixture, with a religious minority of over five per cent. in the whole town, excluding the workhouse.

22715. Is there a single school, with the exception of the Rev. Mr. Lynch's, in which there is not a mixture of children of different denominations?—I think there is.

22716. Name it?—In Guy's female school, out of ninety-one on roll, there are two Roman Catholics. In Guy's infant school, out of 187 on roll there are five Roman Catholics. In the male school, there are two Roman Catholics out of 143. In Harryville boys' there is but one Catholic in eighty-six. In the female school, with seventy-nine, there is no Catholic—which proves the accuracy of my memory that some of them were not mixed—and no mixed school in the town, save the workhouse, has five per cent. of a religious minority.

22717. But though that school has no Roman Catholic child, how many Episcopals are there in it?—I understand a mixed school to be one with Protestants of any denomination and Catholics.

22718. Understanding a mixed school to be a school in which there are children of different denominations, no matter what denominations, are not all the schools in Ballymena mixed?—In that sense eight of the thirteen are.

22719. How many of the pupils in the schools are Episcopals?—I made no inquiry.

22720. Did Mr. Lynch state to you that Catholic children did not attend schools under Protestant teachers?—I don't know that he did make such a statement. I knew what the facts were, from inspection, quite as well as he did.

22721. Was he surprised to find six or seven Roman Catholic children attending one of the mixed schools in the town?—Not with regard to the few in Guy's. He was always friendly to those schools.



22722. Or Harryville school, where there is one child immediately adjoining his own schools?—The only school that surprised him, somewhat, was the boys' school at Broughshane. His surprise was not so much at Catholics attending it, as that, without his knowledge, such shocking abuses could go on with regard to his flock. If you call these ones, or twos, or threes, among hundreds—if you call that united education, you might have hundreds of schools mixed by one child going to each school once in thirteen weeks, to have his name put on the roll.

22723. Mr. Stokes.—Would not cases of mixed marriages, or of Catholic orphans living with Protestant relatives, in many parts of Ireland, explain the presence of a few Catholic children in Protestant schools?—In many places the reason you assign would suffice to explain it, but not in Corrua and such places in Ulster, where Catholics are weak, because there is a general pervasion of Catholics into towns in Antrim and Down.

22724. Mr. Sullivan.—Are there not cases of children of gentlemen's gatekeepers or other servants?—I have given you one just now. In Galgotha the parents who go there, and sign certificates are dependent upon employers in the neighborhood.

22725. Persons more or less under compulsion to send their children?—Yes.

22726. Mr. Gilman.—Do you know of any unusual case?—I consider it compulsion if a landlord supports a school and expenses a week that his tenants will send their children to it. It is the same sort of compulsion I saw lately at an election in Ireland.—"You will vote as you like, but recollect I am your landlord."

22727. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it not the fact that when the Rev. Mr. Lynch was with you, he was ignorant of the very existence of some Roman Catholics and of their residences?—I don't recollect a case of the kind.

22728. Were you with him at Parade?—Yes.

22729. Do you know the case of the McGarrys there?—In Parade, of seventy-one pupils on roll there was not a single Roman Catholic in the school.

22730. Were you with him at that school?—I found a Dissenter, James McCary, parent of Samuel McCary, certainly not a Catholic, sign the Certificate Book to have his son taught the Authorized Version of the Bible, by the master, Langton.

22731. When Mr. Lynch heard the name of McCary, did he not say he must be from Cushindale, as there are people of that name there?—I did not hear it.

22732. Did not the teacher say they were all born in that locality?—I know nothing of it.  
[Adjourned.]

Dec. 3, 1868  
James Wm. Keenan, Esq.

# FIFTY-SEVENTH DAY.—MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1868.

## PARENTS:

The Right Hon. The Earl of Pomeroy, Chairman

The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MURKIN.  
SIR ROBERT KANE, P.R.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., M.C.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NASMYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } Secretaries  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

The Rev. JAMES TORRES sworn and examined

Dec. 7, 1868

Rev. James  
Torres

22733. The Chairman.—What offices do you hold in connexion with the Wesleyan body?—I am the secretary of their Conference, and of present chaplain to the Dublin garrison. That is my direct ministerial appointment.

22734. Is that an appointment under the War Department?—No, it is sanctioned by them, but the appointment is direct from our own Conference.

22735. Are you the minister of any local Wesleyan congregation?—No. My appointment to this garrison is then sanctioned by the Home Guards—on its being notified to the authorities there by our church's officials, a letter is dispatched to the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland informing him that I am authorized to minister to the spiritual wants of the Wesleyans in the garrison, and of that letter a copy is forwarded to me.

22736. How long have you been secretary to the Wesleyan Conference?—Seven years. Previously I had been in a subordinate office in relation to it.

22737. Do the Wesleyan body maintain any primary schools of their own, separate from the Board?—They do.

22738. How many schools in connexion with the body are there under the Board?—I cannot tell.

22739. Is the number considerable?—It is.

22740. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you prepared to speak to the Commission, or to give evidence to it as to either the statistics or history of your connexion with the Board?—Not at all, as I perhaps ought to be, for the truth is I have taken exceedingly little interest in either topic. My work has lain in a different direction almost always.

22741. In what capacity is it your friends have desired you should appear before this Commission?—To give as well as I am able their views on what National education is in the present working in this country, and what it ought to be.

22742. And that, I presume, owing to your official connexion with the body?—Yes, I imagine so.

22743. Then, shall I understand that in stating your view as to the opinions of that body on the subject, you represent generally both the clergy and the laity?—Precisely.

22744. May I ask you then do you approve of the present system of National education in this country?—No, if you put it in that form.

22745. Nevertheless you connected your schools with the system some years ago?—Several; perhaps the majority now.

22746. The schools which are not called mission schools I presume?—Precisely. The mission schools are in our own hands altogether.

22747. May I ask you what led your body to adopt that line of action?—I believe the simple fact that it was the best system of National education that was extant, and we hoped that it might be better.

22748. Should we understand you to say that you did not, even when you joined the Board of Education, approve of the system in all its parts?—Yes, I am quite free to say that.

22749. What are the parts to which you specially refer, of which you did not approve?—Its strong tendency, as we believed and believe still, to denominationalism.

Dec. 7, 1869.

Rev. James  
Follett.

22750. In what way did that tendency, in your opinion, manifest itself?—To take our own case, which is, I suppose, the best one—at least the one with which I am best acquainted—that they allow us to become the patrons of schools, and I cannot see how a school can have as honest, conscientious, earnest men of any denomination as its patrons without that school becoming more or less denominational as its working.

22751. In other words, is it your opinion that the Commissioners of National Education have been adulterating the National system denominationally?—They have been driven to that, I believe.

22752. Anything else in the system in which you take special objection, as a body, in connection with it?—I don't know whether I can say that, as a body, we object to it, and yet I am persuaded that there is a very strong opinion amongst us, pretty widely spread, that the very constitution of the Board itself tends to denominationalism.

22753. In what way?—As being formed of active members of various denominational Churches.

22754. Is your answer do you imply that these parties who are on the Board are appointed as representatives of the Churches?—I take it so.

22755. Well, with regard to the Board of Education, should you, as a body, prefer a change in the present mode of administration?—Undoubtedly.

22756. In what respect?—I am quite free to say that the prevailing opinion with us is, that National education, taking that to be an education as administered and managed by the State, should be purely secular, and administered simply by a Government staff, without respect to all denominations.

22757. Have you in view a large Board or a small Board?—I should certainly prefer a small Board.

22758. Is it your view that such a Board should have fixed rules for the management of the system, and be guided accordingly?—Of course I should think so—others of the State governed by settled rules.

22759. Do you object to the present Board on the ground that a large number of its members are not able to give the necessary attendance for the administration of the system?—No, the other is the objection that weighs most amongst us.

22760. You say you prefer a secular system—that is to say, that the Commissioners of Education should direct their attention more to the secular element? Do you intend thereby that religion should be excluded?—I do.

22761. Altogether from the schools supported by the State?—Yes.

22762. The Ominous.—When you use the word excluded do you mean that religion should be forbidden to be taught in the school houses appointed by the State, or that it should be confined to after hours?—I cannot see any objection to oligarchs or pious laymen being admitted to instruct the pupils after school-hours. I speak simply of the hours prescribed for National instruction, and from them I should exclude religious teaching.

22763. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it your opinion that a good system of education is one in which the religious element can be altogether severed from the secular?—It is my opinion certainly.

22764. And that the teacher paid by the State should confine himself simply to secular instruction?—Certainly; I am decidedly of that opinion.

22765. How would you provide religious instruction?—I would leave it to the Churches to do their own duty.

22766. Do you think the Churches are in a position to discharge their own duty in that respect?—Certainly, if they are worthy anything they ought to do that.

22767. Does there exist the religious and to induce the Churches to look after the religious interests of their children?—Whether you call it religious or not, there is a real for certain needs or churches sufficient to animate them.

22768. I presume you don't know enough of your own schools to be able to say whether or not they are

to any appreciable extent mixed schools as to religious denominations?—Yes; I can say they are to some appreciable extent mixed.

22769. From your acquaintance with the laity of your own Church, do you think, speaking generally, they are in favor of such a system of education as we have at present?—You put rather a difficult question to me. I am free to say the more intelligent of the laymen are decidedly in favor of such a system of education as I have endeavored to sketch. But I should suppose that a large number of men would be stirred by the old cry that was raised about the Bible, and so on.

22770. Is that a growing feeling do you think amongst the educated laity of your communion?—Undoubtedly.

22771. You placed your schools under the Board and became connected with it so late as 1869, I understand?—Yes, at least then; but I think there were individual schools connected before that. I know of one, at least, much earlier than that.

22772. Approving, I presume, of the leading principles of the system of united education?—Yes.

22773. Had you any direct correspondence with the Commissioners or the Resident Commissioner on the subject?—Yes, there was direct correspondence.

22774. Was there an understanding come to between the Commissioners and the Wesleyan body?—Yes.

22775. Negotiations, I presume?—Yes.

22776. Should you regard, then, any departure from the principles of united education as a breach of faith with you, either on the part of the State or of the Commissioners were they to fall back on the denominational system of education?—Undoubtedly I should.

22777. Was it on the understanding that the system should be maintained as one of united secular and separate religious instruction, that as a body you joined it?—Certainly.

22778. Were you led to believe when identifying yourselves with this system that it was one likely to be maintained in this country?—Yes, or we should hardly have laid out so much money as we have in endeavouring to co-operate with it.

22779. A good many of the poorer classes of children attend your schools?—Yes.

22780. And are you perfectly satisfied as a body to conduct your schools in such a way as not to interfere with the faith or the religious views of any portion of the community?—Yes. We hope we are prepared to meet others as we desire to be treated ourselves.

22781. Have you any additional statement to make with regard to your views?—I don't know that I have. I think you have cleared from me the opinions which are entertained.

22782. Have you any document to put in?—I have in my hand a copy of correspondence between a former chairman of our education committee and the Commissioners of National Education.

22783. Should you be disposed to put in that document as expressing the views of your body?—No, but I am willing to place it before you as containing the correspondence and the terms on which arrangements were made between us and the National Board.

22784. Do you wish that document to appear in connection with your examination and to be printed?—I have no objection to that, but not as conveying the opinions of the body now.

22785. Is that the correspondence which took place between your body and the Commissioners of National Education at the time you identified yourselves with the system in 1869?—Yes. It commences November, 1858, and is the correspondence which led to a most extended connection between us and the National Board. As I say, there had been instances previously of schools being connected with the National Board.

22786. That that is a historic document as to your connection with the Board at the time?—Yes.

22787. Should you feel bound by that document now and adhere to the statements contained in it?—Yes; as long as the Board is true to the system it gave to us then, although I am free to my will to

excepted that as the best we could get, we could very well wish a better.

22788. Now in what way could you wish a better? Have you in view any other system, any change?—Oh, dear, yes; I do hope we will come to that. I hope our friends in England will give up their notions of denominational education. They are I know in England disposed to favour it.

22789. The *Christians*.—The *Wesleyans of England*?—Yes, my lord.

22790. Mr. *Dease*.—Can you account for the difference of feeling between the English Wesleyans and the Irish Wesleyans on that point?—I think I can.

22791. From what do you suppose that it arose?—That which will serve their purposes in England, considering their strength and the manner in which parties are balanced there, would be seriously in our way in this country, where we are comparatively feeble and where parties are not at all on an equal footing as to strength.

22792. Do you mean that your numbers are not sufficiently strong in this country to enable you to have the same power of managing your schools that your body has in England?—I do.

22793. Rev. Dr. *Wilson*.—But, keeping in view the system of secular instruction that you prefer, should you not be satisfied, no matter who were parties immediately in charge of the school?—Oh yes, if a purely secular State education be carried out I shall not be afraid of who will have charge of the school.

22794. In anticipation of any change in the system of education in this country have you any opinion to offer?—No, I cannot say that I have any opinion to offer beyond what I have stated. We fear the present system, because we see it tending, as we think, steadily and constantly towards denominationalism. We, some of us, think that we saw the very germ of all that in the original constitution of the Board, and we have seen since then the tendency growing. We fear that, and we wish education to be free—really free. We think, some of us, that we, clerics, have no more business with teaching children, giving them an ordinary secular education, than we have with teaching them trades, and we are as much afraid of our own clerics really as we are of others. It seems to be a weakness in those of us who get into the pulpit that we will denigrate wherever we go.

22795. Mr. *Gibson*.—You have stated, I think, that you were the friend of an entirely secular educational system?—Yes.

22796. As a part of that secular instruction, I presume that you would require that the State should exclude from it all books which should contain references in support of the views of any particular denomination?—Certainly.

22797. The books you think should be free from any religious bias which could touch the conscience of any particular creed?—Yes.

22798. Now you have stated also that you would not be averse to religious instruction given at a separate time in the schoolhouse, if I understand you?—No; I should not be averse to that.

22799. Now what protection would you give to the minority of the creeds attending that school that their religious views should not be interfered with—would you allow those of an opposite creed to attend at the hour given for religious instruction outside the schoolhouse—or what means would you take to protect the minority in such particular school?—I should expect that religious instruction would be kept so completely separate from secular teaching that the master of the school would have no control over the pupils when the secular instruction had closed, and that all the pupils would then be perfectly free to stay for religious instruction or to go.

22800. Do you approve of that rule of the Board, made in 1846, by which a Roman Catholic child going to a Protestant teacher was obliged to have the express written sanction of the parent, in order to entitle him to receive religious instruction from that Protestant teacher?—No, I do not.

22801. Well, then, what protection would you give to the parent that his child should not receive instruction of a religious character while attending that school, during the hours devoted to secular instruction?—I should suppose the control of such a Board as I hinted at and their directions to the masters would be sufficient protection in those hours. After the school had closed I should expect the parent to watch over his own child.

22802. Then you consider that the duty of keeping back a child from such religious instruction would devolve upon the parent, and not on the teacher?—Precisely.

22803. Now you have stated that the majority of your own schools were under the Board, but not your mission schools?—Not our mission schools.

22804. Will you state the distinction between your mission schools properly so-called, and your ordinary schools; which would make it desirable that the one should be under the Board, and the other not under the Board?—There is no distinction in the working of them. There is no distinction in the class of men whom we place as masters, no distinction with regard to them as to where we get them. The simple distinction between them is, that these mission schools where there is a supplement to the fees required, have that supplement granted them from our Mission Fund, one of our Church's funds. In the other case, the supplement to the fees comes from the National Board.

22805. Have those mission schools any religious character separate and apart from the ordinary schools?—They have. We expect in them our catechisms to be taught.

22806. As a part of the ordinary instruction?—Yes.

22807. And therefore those schools would not, properly speaking, form a part of the system of completely secular instruction?—No; certainly not. But I think we should soon give them up if good secular schools were established in the country by the State, and be very glad to do it too.

22808. I think you stated that you objected to the constitution of the Board, inasmuch as it consisted of a number of persons of different denominations?—I did.

22809. Do you not think that the presence of those who hold different religious views is necessary as a protection against the introduction of any measures that may be exclusively in favour of one particular sect?—I am afraid the experiment has not proved that it has been sufficient.

22810. You object to the constitution on principle?—I do.

22811. Now, supposing that each member of that Board did his duty faithfully, would it not be a security to the public at large of different creeds, that no interference would be made with the religious views of any of the children in the schools, if they had on that Board representatives, if I may so speak, of their particular views, to watch over their particular interests—supposing that they did their duty, according to the theory of the Board?—According to the theory of the Board; but then members of the Board may have their own views of their duties to their flocks.

22812. Lord Stanley in his letter, which forms the original constitution of the Board, says this:—

"The various reports of the Commissions of Education recommended a system to be adopted which should afford, if possible, a combined literary and a separate religious education, and should be capable of being so far adapted to the views of the different religious persuasions which divide Ireland, as to render it in truth a system of National education for the lower classes of the community. For the success of this scheme much must depend on the character of the individuals composing the Board, and on the security thereby afforded to the country, that whilst the interests of religion are not overlooked, the most scrupulous care shall be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils. To attain the first object it appears essential that a portion of the Board should be composed of men of high personal character, and of equal spirit in the Church; for the latter, that it should consist of persons professing different religious opinions."

Dec. 7, 1868.

Rev James  
Totter

Now, has that statement of my Lord Stanley your concurrence or not?—I have no doubt of my Lord Stanley's excellent intentions, but I have of the sufficiency of the means he adopted to attain his end.

22813. Can you suggest any other means now by which the end would be more likely to be attained?—If you would first be kind enough to define what end you aim at.

22814. Your system is then a purely secular instruction for all classes?—Given by the State.

22815. Given by the State, and superintended of course by some executive?—Of course.

22816. And you object, as I understand, to the executive consisting of persons of different creeds?—I do object to it consisting of persons of different creeds who are unpaid agents, and uncontrolled, therefore, by the Government. I should wish them Government officers.

22817. Will you state exactly what your plan is, because that is what I am desirous to get at?—I have already, in a reply to a question addressed to me by Dr Wilson, stated that I should desire a small Board appointed by the Government of paid officers, who should be as thoroughly State commissioned officers as the colonels of Her Majesty's regiments, to use an illustration from my own department of work just now, and so directly under the control of the Government.

22818. Do you think that the public at large would have as much confidence in that Board as in a Board constituted according to Lord Stanley's original views?—I believe in a very short time they would have more—much more.

22819. The Chairman.—Do you think of such a Board consisted of two or three Commissioners, that either of the two great religious sections in Ireland would be satisfied if the members of that Board were all Protestants or all Roman Catholics?—I do not suppose they would be satisfied immediately, but I do believe that in a short time they would become satisfied—the public would. Whether the clergy of the Churches would is another question.

22820. Would the Wesleyan body be satisfied?—That we should.

22821. Mr. Deane.—If they were all Roman Catholics?—Yes, even so. We should trust three State officials—Roman Catholics, lay-gentlemen, accessible to public opinion, and under its control, as we do not seek a Board as it now exists.

22822. The Chairman.—Should you propose to carry out your system, to abolish the existing compositions of the office having two members of different religious opinions, and having Inspectors of opposite religious opinions?—I would say, my lord, freely, that the question of religious opinions should not enter into the qualification of men for such offices at all.

22823. Do you consider that the National system of education is now more denominational than it was at its first institution?—I do—in its operation rather, perhaps, than in its constitution.

22824. Does the present state of the system impede the working of the Wesleyan schools under the Board?—Does your lordship mean impede our free action in those schools, or the extension of our work in that department?

22825. Does it impede the free action of your body or the efficiency of the instruction communicated in the schools?—No, my lord, I am not aware that it does, materially.

22826. Then what is your practical objection to the existing state of things?—That Churches obtain a power over National education in proportion to their numbers, and that they get an influence over National education, which Churches ought not to have at all, as such.

22827. Do you consider that any of the changes which have taken place in the National system of education have been prejudicial to the Wesleyans?—Any of the changes that have taken place in the working?

22828. Yes?—I do.

22829. Have the Wesleyans any representatives on

the National Board?—No, my Lord; that has been refused to us.

22830. Do the Wesleyans think that their interests have suffered from want of having such representation on the Board?—I am not sure that we have. We think that we have suffered in our status; but whether we have really suffered in the practical working of the system is another question. I do not suppose that one representative, which is the utmost that we could have expected, could have served us very materially.

22831. Mr. Waddell.—What is the estimated number of Wesleyans in Ireland, can you tell?—We report above 20,000 members of society; but if you multiply that by five it would be probably near the number of our adherents.

22832. But do you not know more nearly than that the number in all Ireland?—No, we do not number any except what you may call the members of our society; as inner circle within the Church.

22833. Then the outside number, according to that estimate, would be about 100,000?—About 180,000 of our immediate adherents, and we have very many bands who hear us occasionally, and might be called adherents.

22834. Judge Morris.—In your body, the Wesleyans, do many consist of what may be called the poorer classes?—Yes, a large portion.

22835. Are the Wesleyan body, particularly in any part of Ireland, pecuniarily rather than in another, or are they scattered all over the country?—Yes, they are scattered all over the country, but we are stronger in some parts than in others.

22836. In what parts?—In Ulster, chiefly—above all, in Belfast and Portadown.

22837. Do not all of that portion of the Wesleyan body in the other three provinces, Leitrim, Munster, and Connaught, belong to what you may call the middle classes?—Oh, not all; but the proportion of poor is not so great in those provinces as in Ulster.

22838. Mr. Deane.—You have stated that you would let the Churches do their own duty in the matter of education; upon whom would you throw the onus of deciding in the case of any particular Church what was the duty of that Church?—Now, that is a hard question. May I answer for our own Church?

22839. If you please?—I cannot answer for others. We should have it agitated in our local congregations, and it would come up to our Conference, probably, in due time—to our annual Conference, having first been agitated in local circles. We should then lay down the rules there. But I think we know our duty already in that matter without further discussion.

22840. And supposing that the notion of duty held by your body differed, as in point of fact it does differ from that held by the Roman Catholics, with whom would you leave the right to decide what was their duty, and what was the duty of the Roman Catholic Church in the matter of education?—I am not solicitous to teach that Church what is its duty. All I should be solicitous for would be that the State should take care that its officers should do their duty, and not suffer their duty to be modified with by any Church; and then let the Churches look after their own interests.

22841. If the decision came to on the matter of education by the State were adverse to what the Roman Catholics believe to be their duty, how would you meet that case?—Am I expected to answer that question?

22842. I should like an answer to it, because it seems to me to be a very material question, but if you do not wish to answer it I shall not press it. Surely not. I cannot be asked that I should say what the clergy should do or what the State should do if it came to a collision the weaker would have to go to the wall—that is all.

22843. I do not press the question. You have stated as a maxim that you are willing to adopt that you would treat others as you would wish them to treat you?—Most decidedly.

22844. Would you consent to modify that maxim

so far as to say that you would treat others as they wish to be treated?—No.

22845. Mr. Webbster.—Did I understand you to say that your body was unfairly treated by the Board of National Education?—Oh, I would not say unfairly treated. They have kept faith with us. I do not recollect that I stated that.

22846. I thought that in a previous answer you conveyed that you thought that justice had not been done to them. Then you don't mean to convey that you think you have suffered in that respect?—I am very free to say that we know the Board to have persecuted others to do things which we have not asked for certainly, but which we believed they would never have permitted us to do.

22847. But you have not been refused anything?—We have not tried them. We are a quiet people rather, and take the good that we can get.

22848. Mr. Gibbons.—You are aware that the appointment of a Commissioner does not rest with the Board itself, but with the Government of the country?—I am aware of that.

22849. Mr. Stokes.—Can you say whether the Wesleyan schools are chiefly visited or non-visited?—They are non-visited chiefly.

22850. Are many of them connected with meeting-houses?—I cannot say. I have stated at the outset that I am not at all well up in our statistics.

22851. And can you say whether they are all under exclusive Wesleyan management?—Yes, all our schools are under Wesleyan patron, lay or clerical.

22852. Will you tell the meaning in which you speak of denominational schools or denominationalism?—Education coming under the control of the several Churches of the land is what I understand by denominationalism in education.

22853. Would you call a school which in reference to religion bears a distinctive stamp a denominational school?—If you mean by a distinctive stamp a distinctive stamp derived from religious practices or ideas I say yes.

22854. Are you aware that the Board of National Education has always regarded schools such as those under your management very much in that light?—No, I am not aware, but I suppose they do.

22855. Will you be so kind as to read paragraph 29 of the Sixth Report of the Commissioners?—(Reads).—

"We are aware, of course, that schools in which the parents themselves provide religious instruction for children call of a particular consideration, leaving it to the parents or guardians to provide it for all others, bear in some degree a peculiar religious aspect. All schools of such a descriptive, when connected with Presbyterian meeting-houses, appear to us to stand upon the same principle as schools connected with communities of the Roman Catholic persuasion; and to these we have been, from the commencement of our labours, granting aid, having first communicated with His Majesty's Government on the subject, and being sanctioned by it in doing so. Indeed, all schools in general which are under the direction of persons, only of one communion, may be considered to bear a distinctive stamp, but although we are required to give a preference to applications signed by persons of different persuasions, we are not required to restrict it to cases of that description."

22856. Does not that extract show that 30 years ago the Board regarded that branch of their system which has received the largest extension, and to which the Wesleyan schools chiefly belong, as bearing a distinctive stamp in reference to religion, and being so far denominational?—Yes.

22857. Do you object to the teaching of your own religion in schools?—I do, most decidedly.

22858. Is that a positive objection, or has it relation to the possibility of other religions being taught in other schools?—It is a positive objection of my own, and I know it to be by many others amongst us.

22859. Supposing that all the inhabitants of this country were Wesleyans, would you say that their

religious teaching should still be excluded from schools?—No, I suppose not; for then we should have the masters all Methodists.

22860. Is it because the majority differ from you in religion that you raise the objection?—When I said "I suppose," I meant to imply that in such a case as that which it requires a considerable power of imagination even to entertain as a supposition, we should have it all our own way, we should not be troubled with difficult questions, but in the state of the country I strongly object to even our body, or to any Church, conveying religious instruction in the schools.

22861. Would it be a misrepresentation of the case to say that Wesleyans are willing to make a little sacrifice in order to inflict a great loss upon the Roman Catholic majority of their fellow-countrymen?—We believe it would be a gain to all parties.

22862. The *Quinquina*.—Are the teachers in your National schools either exclusively or principally belonging to your own body?—Principally, not exclusively, I think. But again, I must admit any want of acquaintance with the working of the system.

22863. Do the Wesleyans take any pains to rear up a set of schoolmasters of their own body in Ireland?—Of late years we have been doing so, my lord.

22864. What means have you taken to effect that object?—Getting them introduced to the model schools as monitors and paid teachers.

22865. Do you devote any part of your own educational funds, or any of your own religious funds, to forwarding the education of these young people?—We do.

22866. In what manner?—We have in Dublin no institution in which they are boarded and brought into use as teachers.

22867. Are they taught in your own institution or are they boarded with you and taught in Marlborough-street?—In that institution they are taught and trained as teachers. That was in connexion with our missions, and they are intended for our mission schools. There are also some of our young people in the Marlborough-street training schools.

22868. What number of teachers are trained in your establishment?—But a small number indeed. I cannot say how many.

22869. Are they male or female?—Male teachers. All that Mr. McMillan, who was with you the other day, was competent to give, and I suppose did give.

22870. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Your attention has been called to Lord Stanley's letter to the paragraph which says that the Board should be composed of men of high personal character, and of exalted station in the Church. Now, was not the intention of Lord Stanley shown in the appointment of a small Board at first?—I believe so.

22871. Are you aware that the Board was a small Board, composed of seven persons?—I really am not aware of the number, but it was small as compared with its present force.

22872. And of those seven persons, but one Protestant and one Roman Catholic of exalted station in the Church, and one Presbyterian clergyman and four laymen?—I believe that was the constitution of the Board. I think it was, as well as I can recollect.

22873. There was not then the principle recognised of an equal number of Protestant Commissioners on the one side and Roman Catholic Commissioners on the other—are you aware of that?—It seems not.

22874. Is it not plain that there was not then the same desire as to balancing religious interests, which has since to be the principle of the Board lately?—Yes; so it strikes me; in fact it seems to me that Lord Stanley's original ideas have undergone many modifications in the working, and, as I think, in every case for the worse.

22875. Now, on looking to the last report of the Commissioners of Education, I perceive that there is no person of exalted station among the Commissioners, belonging to either the Protestant or the Roman Catholic Church on the Board; would you in that case say that the Board is at present conducted on the

Dec. 7, 1868. principle of Lord Stanley's letter, quoted by Mr. Gibson?—Certainly not.  
 22876 Do you think, now, that the system has been thirty-seven years in existence, the same necessity exists for the Board representing Churches?—I think not.  
 22877 Especially when many of its members cannot and do not give their attention to its business?—

I think not. I think my lord made a mistake when he adopted that idea of Church representation in the Board of National Education.  
 22878 And when, in connection with the religious element, dissenters are supposed to be frequent at the Board, and protests numerous, does that confirm you in your idea?—Quite so; the whole history of it does.

# MR. TOMLIN'S LETTER.

124, Tritonville-road,  
 Dublin, 12nd February, 1869.

Mr. Leese,—I had, several weeks since, the honour to be examined before the Royal Commission on Primary Education in Ireland, in which you preside. I then expressed some opinions and made some statements regarding which, in my want of experience in the mode of such inquiries, I expected further questioning, and as they now stand in the printed copy of my examination, they therefore seem to need some explanation. I have no wish to occupy further the time of the Commissioners with such explanations of what I now communicate may in any way be attached to the report of my examination. If not, I certainly do desire to present myself again before your lordship and the gentlemen associated with you; but in the hope that what I write will be permitted to appear as I desire, I proceed.

I. In justification of my reply to Question 22866, I enclose the following copy of a letter which I received some time since from one of my brother ministers:—"My dear Mr. Tomlin,—On this subject of united education I call to mind two facts, and note them now lest they should escape me at another time. 1. There was an attendance at Miss-street of nine Roman Catholic children. The priest called one day and asked to see the register, which he examined. The following week all the Roman Catholic children were withdrawn from the school. The teacher expressed one of the facts, and I told him to take no notice but proceed with his usual teaching as usual, giving attention to his scholars. In the course of a few weeks the children were back again to the school."

"2. As to the new rule requiring the parent to certify in writing in the book provided for the purpose in the school his wish that his children should attend religious instruction—the teacher being of a different creed—there were three Roman Catholic children at Whitcomb's attending religious instruction at the wish of the parents verbally expressed to the teacher. When this regulation came into force he was obliged to prohibit their attendance, and the parents would not write and sign in the book what they had

expressed verbally, and what I have no doubt they really wished.

"The parents of whatever denomination are the disturbing element."

It is corroborated by my statement made in answer to Q. 22844, I instance what any member of the Commission may see if he shall pass from the Drogheda railway station down into the town. Across the front of a large building stands the inscription, in large letters—"St. Mary's Convent Schools," and over the door of entrance thereon, in much smaller—"National Schools." Or if any member will take the trouble to drive out by Desert-street to the Drumcondra-bridge he will see on the front of a school-house there—"St. Francis Xavier's Female National School." Now we Wesleyans should not attempt to set up a denominational distinction over a National school, for beside that, our duty bids us do not cease to be loyal to the principles of a sectarian National institution; we desire to be loyal to the principles of National education, while it is evident the parents of these schools feel themselves at liberty to overrule them.

III. And, lastly, I am compelled by facts to qualify my reply to Q. 22847. Our fair claim for a representation on the Board of Commissioners of National Education has been evaded, and the proportion of good teachers which the rules of the Board would assign us in the model schools has not, though demanded, been granted as in some instances. I name the Emmetville Model School.

I have now, my Lord, scarcely to request that your Lordship will take such steps as may be necessary to correct in the report of the Royal Commission these explanations with what already appears there under my name.

I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's obedient servant,

(Signed,) JAMES TOMLIN, Wesleyan Minister.

To the Right Hon. the Earl of Powis,  
 Chairman of the Royal Commission  
 on Primary Education in Ireland.

JAMES WILLIAM KATYNAUGH, Esq., is further examined.

James Wm.  
 KATYNAUGH,  
 Esq.

22879 The Chairwoman.—Have you any other instances in which you allege violations of the rule of the Board in the cases of those schools we have been going through?—There are some other cases of cases. Your lordship will observe that a large number of the parents referred to are mothers—in general they are all mothers; and a remarkable case occurs in a school in Belfast, where there are as many as seven children in the school, Roman Catholics, the father a Roman Catholic, the mother a Presbyterian, and the seven children were educated by the mother to receive Presbyterian and Protestant religious instruction, which is manifestly contrary to the provision of the Poor Law Act on the subject, and contrary to the law and the position of the Board.

22880 When you say "the law of the Board," do you refer to any printed rules or regulations, or to that law which you referred to the other day?—To the model Register of the School, as first introduced in the year 1856. I mentioned to you that it was I who drew it up, and as that model register of the school I had down the civil law with regard to religious registration—that the father is the legal guardian of the child, next to him the mother, and then the nearest natural or legal guardian, in the ordinary Poor Law sense. And where there is any difference of creed, the person having the first legal right must be got to register the religion of the child, in the first instance. The Inspectors are fully aware of that, as you see in the case

where Mr. Mc'Donnell, the Inspector, cancelled the Certificate in Killybeg School, county Down. I give this as a case in point, in support of that view.

22881 Is that creed Certificate, to which the Notice was appended, a document that still remains in force?—In full force, without any change since 1856.

22882 Then do I understand that the next class of induction would be that the Certificate is signed by the mother, she not being the proper party during the life of the father?—And the mother being, in this case, of a different creed from that of the father and of the children.

22883 Does the fact of the father and mother being of different creeds make any difference?—Oh, very great, my lord. In the Explanatory Minute by the Board, already in evidence, they say "the Parent," meaning the legal parent, that has authority.

22884 I observe that in the School Register the language is, "When a child presents himself for admission into a school, it is most desirable he should be accompanied by either parent, the father if possible." Does not that admit that the mother is competent to register, if the father, from absence or occupation in business, is unable to attend?—Clearly; but the Teacher should make inquiry, if he has any apprehension that there is a difference in religion between the Parents; and if your lordship will be good enough to read the remainder of the paragraph, you will see pre-

vision is made for that, when you come to the subject of religious registration.

22885. I do not observe in this notice on the School Register or in the Minutes of the Board of the 25th of February, 1867, any special rule for the case in which the parents of the children are of different religions?—It is implied in the words with regard to the registration. It was I who drew up the direction, and it is implied therein.

22886. Under the circumstances, can you extend that even in the case of the Parents being of different religions, the mother's signing the Religious Certificate is an infraction of the literal rule of the Board?—Not merely of the literal rule, but of the spirit of the rule, and even of the known civil law of the land.

22887. Mr. Gibson.—What is the name of the school you last referred to?—Charlotte-street School, Belfast. Roll number 4835. Visited the 11th September, teacher, Alexander P. Miller, absent; assistant, Lizzie Steel, in charge. Name of the mother, Miss Jane Curran. She authorized her children, James, William, Robert, John, Mary, Ellen, and Catherine, under her signature, by a book, dated 29th April, 1868, to be taught the Holy Scriptures, in the Authorized Version, the father being a mechanic, absent at his work, and a Roman Catholic. The patron of the school is the Rev. Dr. Knox, a well-known and respected Presbyterian clergyman.

22888. You are reading your own notes, I presume?—Oh, certainly.

22889. All these matters do not appear in the Certificate?—I am told, and it was my duty to ascertain, many things that do not appear in the Certificate.

22890. The Chairman.—Will you point to the words in "Rule 2, Registration," on which you rely in support of your position that, in cases of mixed marriages, the father ought to sign the Certificate for Religious Instruction?—The Instructions for keeping the Register of all National schools have been in existence since the year 1864, drawn up by me, approved of by the Board, and never altered from that date up to the present, stand thus:—

"When a child presents himself for admission to the school, it is most desirable that he should be accompanied by either Parent, the Father, if possible, or if not by a Parent, then by an elder brother or sister, a grand-parent, uncle, aunt, or, in the case of an orphan, by its nearest natural or other legal guardian. It is from one of these that the religious denomination of the child must be ascertained, and, when once registered, it must not be changed on the Register except on the application of the Parent, or of such natural or other guardian as may be legally authorized to direct such a change."

The words "legally authorized" are italicised, in order to clearly indicate the meaning. The Law of the land, in this behalf, is referred to here, and the Father, by the Law of the land, is the legally authorized guardian, the mother in the absence of the father, and so on, in different degrees, well known to the legal gentlemen here present.

22891. Assuming your interpretation of the law to be correct, would not the best part of the rule, allowing the mother to Register the child, if the father is unable or unwilling to come, be contrary to the law?—Oh, no, so long as the teacher knows that the parents are of one religion and that there is no difference of creed in the family—in fact the teacher is not bound, at all, to make inquiry or to insist on the parent coming, if he has satisfied himself—it is in order to make the thing perfectly close, and to call attention to the only hint or difficulty that could arise, namely, where there is conflict with regard to the religious belief of the family. Mr. Deane, as Chairman of a Board of Guardians, knows well the law on this matter. Unfortunately, in Ireland, these things are so constantly among, so that the law of the case is well known.

22892. According to your understanding of the law, can a mother legally act as parent during the life of the father?—A mother cannot decide the religion of the child during the life of the father, while the child is under age.

22893. Can a mother register a child, legally, according to your view of the law?—Oh, certainly, if she registers it for the father, and in the father's creed, but only as the father's agent.

22894. Would she be legally authorized to direct a change of religion even if the father consented?—If the father consented she would, then she does it for the father, and, clearly, not as from herself.

22895. What are the schools to which you refer under this head?—Charlotte-street, Belfast, roll No. 4835; patron, the Rev. Mr. Knox, Presbyterian minister; seven children of the one mother, she being a Presbyterian, and the father a Roman Catholic.

22896. Are there any other schools under this head?—No, I have no other to give on this point, but I can give you another remarkable case—that of the Elm-street school, Belfast, Rev. Mr. Vance, patron. I find a certificate from John Smith, father of William Smith, a Roman Catholic, authorizing his child to be taught "the Spelling Book or the Authorized Version of the Scriptures." If you will excuse the use of the word, I would say that it is one of the devices made use of for trapping the children—it is a school built, put on the Certificate, to catch the unfortunate Catholic parents.

22897. Mr. Gibson.—What denomination does Mr. Vance belong to?—I think he is a Wesleyan or Methodist.

22898. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Which is he—a Wesleyan or a Methodist?—He is a Wesleyan.

22899. Now, can you not assign any fair reason for the fact of a mother going with her child to school, and the father not going, without any imputation of motive?—I can, clearly.

22900. What reason?—The father being occupied; but, if so, the greater the anxiety for the rules being rigidly carried out, in the case of mixed marriages.

22901. You have said that in the case of mixed marriages the teacher should make inquiry?—Yes.

22902. May I ask how is the teacher to know that it is a case of mixed marriage?—I have only to say that it is invariably done in the Central Model School, and all the Model Schools in Ireland, where there are superior officers of the Board acquainted with the law of the institution.

22903. Where is the rule instructing them to inquire?—It is implied, clearly, in what I have read.

22904. Point out the rule instructing the teacher to inquire?—The instruction is implied in the directions for registration.

22905. Give the clause?—"It is from one of these (meaning the Parents or Guardians) that the religious denomination of the child must be ascertained, and, when once registered, it must not be changed in the Register, except on the application of the Parent, or of such natural or other guardian as may be legally authorized to direct such change."

22906. Mention the specific clause instructing the teacher to inquire?—It is implied in this—for as only the particular parent has power to alter—so it is only that parent had power, originally, to register. One is implied, as a logical consequence, of the other.

22907. How is the teacher to know the case of a mixed marriage?—He is to ask as there such.

22908. Where is the law empowering or instructing the teacher to know it?—Not to know it; but to inquire. It is implied in what I have read, and I have simply to state, as a matter of fact, that in every Model School in Ireland, it is so done.

22909. When is the teacher to inquire?—When the child first comes to the school.

22910. Where?—In the school, when the parent comes.

22911. If he is in doubt where is he to go?—He is to make every inquiry he can, for example, from other children in the neighbourhood, or to suspend the registration, for some days, until he satisfies himself on the point. If he has a reasonable doubt, he should not register, until he satisfied himself.

22912. How is he to satisfy himself?—By local inquiry.

Dec 3, 1868.

James Wm. Lavett,  
sq.

Dec. 7, 1905

JAMES WILK  
Kilvagh,  
Co.

22913 Is that to be at the father's house, if necessary?—If necessary, certainly.

22914 If he inquires at the father's house, according to your own view, is not that canvassing?—Certainly not. Pardon me; it is for the purpose of registering the creed of the child—which is a very different thing from tampering with him, to know what religious instruction he will consent to.

22915 The *Chairman*.—Have you any other classes?—There is a very remarkable case here in Academy-street, Belfast. There are two schools, the Academy-street Mixed School, and the Academy-street Infant School, immediately off Donegal-street, in Belfast. In the Academy-street mixed school, I found one hundred and eleven pupils on the roll, of whom sixteen were Roman Catholics. In the Academy-street infant school, I found eighty-two on the roll, of whom eighteen were Roman Catholics, making thirty-four Roman Catholics, in both—one of the largest numbers I met, in any school in Belfast, for mixed schools are fast disappearing.

22916 Who is the Patron?—The Rev. Hugh Haime.

22917 Mr. *Giles*.—You give these as a sample of mixed schools?—No, I mentioned that incidentally. I say there are very few such schools in Belfast—there are only two or three worth noticing.

22918 Mr. *Deane*.—Are these schools in the borough?—Yes, immediately off Donegal-street. I found some Certificates filled in the school by Roman Catholic parents—some few, none, I think, in the boys' school, and but three or four in the girls' school. The master is quite a young lad, about nineteen years of age—a young man named Campbell; he had just been appointed from the Newtownards Model school. When asking him why the Roman Catholic children were allowed to remain during religious instruction, he pleaded the short period he was in office, and his want of knowledge of the parents. He stated that the Inspector, Mr. Milroy, had been there, lately, and had paid one or two visits, urging him to look up obtaining the signatures and Certificates from the parents; and referring me to the mistress of the infant school up stairs, who is much longer in office, for further information. The mistress is a respectable married woman, Mrs. Houston, four years in office in the school, and, therefore, intimately acquainted with its working. When questioning her to know why Catholic children were attending at religious instruction, with scarcely any authority by Certificate or otherwise, she stated she sent for the parents, but that they would not come—that several of them were mothers of illegitimate children, that they frequently came to the school asking to have the very names of the children changed; and she said to me that I evidently must be a stranger in the locality, and not acquainted with the morals of the neighbourhood. I asked her what was the particular nature of the locality, and she gave me the names of a number of streets, which I will put down, or not, as your Lordship wishes, where the best characters are not—seven or eight streets in the vicinity. She told me other circumstances with regard to the school, parallel for which, I believe, does not exist in the three Kingdoms; but I may simply say, she stated that the whole neighbourhood was immoral.

22919 Is your allegation in this case, with respect to the mixed and the infants' school in Academy-street, that some of the children attended without proper Certificates?—Nearly all of them without any Certificates, and the mistress gave this explanation, stated before, as her apology, for violating the Rule.

22920 Mr. *Stokes*.—Why, if the fathers were not available, did not she take the Certificates from the mothers?—She said she found difficulty in getting the mothers to come; and she also stated that, at the instance of her patron, she was accustomed, for a while, to make a house to house visitation, with these visits because so thoroughly revolting to her, that she had to give them up.

22921 Rev. Dr. *Wilson*.—Did you approve of the suggestion or advice given by Mr. Milroy in this case?—I wholly disapprove of it. I believe Mr. Milroy is an honest and conscientious officer. I met

him at the train, and he asked me did I meet many cases of the sort. He stated he was doing his best, and that he believed it part of his duty to get the Certificates, in that way. It was, however, a mistaken view of his duty; but I do not at all believe he had any bad or sinister design in it. It was merely a misconception of the rule and of his duty.

22922 The *Chairman*.—Have you any other classes?—Not a class, but as it would appear most of those were cases of Presbyterian schools, I think it only fair to say I have one or two others. In the St. Anne's male and St. Anne's female schools in the town of Belfast, formerly Church Education schools, but which have recently joined the National Board, I found two Certificates in the female school, in which, out of eighty-two children on the roll, there were seven Roman Catholics. These two were obtained by canvassing, also.

22923 Mr. *Deane*.—Only two out of the seven Roman Catholics had certificates?—Yes, there were only two Certificates, while there were seven children attending religious instruction.

22924 Is your statement this, that there were, in point of fact, five Roman Catholic children attending religious instruction given by a non-Catholic and without Certificates?—Yes, seven were attending religious instruction, while I found only two had Certificates.

22925 That is, there were five without certificates?—Yes.

22926 Mr. *Giles*.—You use the word canvassing in the same sense that you stated before?—Yes.

22927 Rev. Dr. *Wilson*.—Did you ascertain how many of these seven children had been receiving religious instruction previous to the school being placed under the Board?—No, I made no inquiry on the point.

22928 Mr. *Deane*.—How long was it since the school became a National school—you said it had been a Church Education school?—I don't think it can be more than about a year a National school.

22929 Have you any further cases?—In the school of Ballybally, part of the town of Stranabally, in the county Donegal, a Roman Catholic school, the patron being the parish priest, Rev. Mr. McManis, I found three Protestants on the roll, but not attending religious instruction. There was no Certificate Book in the school. I bring this rather as a charge against the Inspector, for not verifying a copy.

22930 The three Protestant children were not attending religious instruction?—No, not in that case; but I did find a case in this parish in Dublin, of a Protestant child attending Catholic Religious Instruction in a Catholic school, and I particularly request his lordship will allow me to bring it forward.

22931 Rev. Dr. *Wilson*.—Did you learn that in many cases there were Protestant children attending Roman Catholic schools under similar circumstances?—No; not one single instance save this—and in this the child had left the school before my visit. I visited numbers of mixed schools, in Ulster, under Roman Catholic management. I inquired, particularly into the working of the schools in that respect, and in no one instance, in the North of Ireland, did I find any abuse. I did find one in a National school in Cardinal Cullen's parish, and I bring it forward with great pleasure, to show fair play on both sides.

22932 The *Chairman*.—Where did this special case occur which is not included in the list furnished to us?—In St. Patrick's school, in this parish, Roll No. 9767. It is a remarkable case. The father of the child—a Protestant servant man, named Daniel, was living away, and he left his daughter, Margaret, with a woman named Bennett. This woman, very properly, registered the child as a Protestant, but she went to the school, some time after the registration, and gave a Certificate that Margaret Daniel, the child under her guardianship, should receive instruction in the Roman Catholic catechism and prayers. This Certificate was dated 12th March, 1887, but as soon as the father, or some one else, found it out, the child was taken away, and she had left the school three weeks, at the date of my visit. This was the only instance I met in my



whole town, where a Protestant pupil received Catholic instruction in a Roman Catholic school—or that I found anything like it.

22933. I think we understood from you that the cases you gave to us were not the only cases which you had observed, but samples of different classes of cases taken from a larger number?—Yes, for example, I will give you two cases, here in the city, that come to my knowledge, since I sent in the list. There are two schools near you here—one in Balton-street, the other in Dorset-street. I visited these schools on the 17th of last month. The one in Dorset-street is held in a private house, upon the hall-door of which, being the only entrance to the school, you find a sign plate inscribed, in large characters, "Catholic School, Presbyterian Church, Ormeau-quay." Of sixty-eight children on the roll, the day I visited, fifty-three were

Presbyterians, thirteen Established Church, and two Wesleyans or others. The course of religious instruction in the school is from 10 to 10.30 a.m., daily, with the exception of Wednesday, when it is from 10 to 11 o'clock, and the Rev. J. J. Black, the Patron, attends; the matter of the religious instruction being reading the Authorized Version of the Scriptures, hymns, psalter, and the Shorter Catechism. There is a Certificate Book in the school, but there are no entries in it, and all the children receive a common religious instruction. The thirteen Established Church children and the two Dissenters learn the Authorized Version of the Scriptures, prayers, and hymns, to which there is no objection—at least to the hymns and to the Authorized Version, but there is to the Catechism; it is a violation of the rules of the Board, there being no Certificate.

[Adjourned.]

Dec 7, 1868.

James Wm. Ransburgh, Esq.

# FIFTY-EIGHTH DAY.—DUBLIN, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1868

## PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of FOWLE, Chairman.

The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MORRIS  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BASSELL, Esq., M.C.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT MARSHALL STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. STUART, Esq., M.D.  
LAURENCE WALSH, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } Secretary's  
D. B. DUNCK, Esq., }

The Very Rev. Monsignore LAWRENCE FORD, F.R., F.S., sworn and examined.

Dec 8, 1868.

22936. The Chairman.—What are the ecclesiastical offices you hold?—I am parish priest of a suburban parish, and am one of the vicars-general of the diocese of Dublin.

22935. Are you able to speak generally of the views entertained by the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics as to National education?—Well, not any more than as a matter of general information. I don't fill a representative capacity in any way. I am tolerably conversant—from meeting and speaking with them—with the views entertained by a great number of the episcopacy and other clergy of my own time of life and position.

22936. Have you much experience yourself as a manager of the efficiency of the secular education given in the ordinary National schools?—I cannot say that I have. My occupations are of a character that take me a good deal away from the details of the working of my parish, and the duties of it are therefore discharged in some measure—perhaps even a considerable measure—by my curates or assistants.

22937. How many schools have you under your management?—I have none. I am speaking of my management as a parochial clergyman, because I don't at present fill the office of official manager of the schools under the Board. I have two schools at Black-rock, two schools at Ballyferret, two schools at Booterstown, two schools at Dunleath, and a school at a place called Kilmosney.

22938. When you say you have "two schools," do you mean one boys' school and one girls' school?—Yes.

22939. Is there any interference of religion in the schools of any of those schools?—None practically that I am aware of. There have been, I think, during the time I have been connected with the parish, and for a great portion of that time I have been connected with the schools also as official manager, not more than for Protestants in all the schools, and those only for a very short time.

22940. What was the practice with regard to those children at periods of religious instruction?—Well, they were under peculiar circumstances. With regard

to one of them, the master sent, as a matter of course, the official notice to the parent that religious instruction was given at such and such an hour, and that the child should be therefore requested to absent himself, and I suppose, as a matter of course, the child did withdraw. Two of the children were in a vested school at Ballyferret, and my attention was drawn to the matter principally at the time—the time when Major O'Reilly moved for a return in the House of Commons, which the House of Commons granted. These two children were receiving Roman Catholic religious instruction from the schoolmasters by the direction of the children's parents. The fourth case was rather a curious one also. The child's father was a Protestant; the child's mother was a Catholic. The child himself was about twelve years of age, he was a Roman Catholic also; but I believe at the time he entered the school without the cognizance of the father. The schoolmaster drew the attention of the curate to the matter at the time, and the curate told him to observe the usual rule, and to send the child out during the time of religious instruction. Subsequently, however, the father of the child himself came to the school, and he did not formally state that the child should be educated as a Roman Catholic, or given religious instruction, but he gave the master instructions to teach the child how to serve the Roman Catholic Mass, so that the master very properly looked on it as equivalent to a consent to the child's receiving religious instruction, and since that time the child has been brought up in the school as a Roman Catholic like any of the other children.

22941. Do you find that the rules of the Board as to religious instruction impede you in giving sufficient religious instruction in the school to the children?—Practically, as the schools are perfectly denominational, they impede me very little; because the schools are principally in the hands of teachers who have my entire confidence for their probity and earnestness of life and capability of giving instruction, and also in the hands of religious sisters—that is, a number of them. The principal schools give a type and a character to all the other schools of the parish,

Very Rev. Monsignore Lawrence Ford, F.R.S.

Dec 3, 1892  
 Very Rev.  
 Monsignor  
 Lawrence  
 Ffrench, &c.,  
 &c.

even where they are not directly under the care of religious, and the result is our schools are conducted practically as if they were denominational schools.

22943. Do you consider the secular instruction given in National schools generally efficient?—Well, I cannot say I am a very good judge; but from all that has come under my own observation, I really think the teachers attempt too much, and that they try to make the instruction of verily too varied a character in the more advanced stages of their course, and in the elementary course I think they aim too much, if I may use the expression, at philosophical or theoretical instruction, and therefore a good deal of practical knowledge, such as reading, writing, and things of that kind, is lost to the children by too great a straining after knowledge of rules and principles.

22943. Do you think sufficient pains is taken in general to press the children forward through the First and Second Books?—I really am not competent to give an opinion on the matter. As I said before, a good deal of my attention is taken up with affairs outside my parish, and the result is that when I do attend the schools (and I seldom pass a week without going once or twice, and even oftener, into some of the schools) it is principally the religious aspect of the question I interest myself about.

22944. Do many of the children in your schools pay school fees?—In the schools under the National Board—that is, in all my schools except one—I must say the fees are very badly paid.

22945. Do you encourage or discourage the teachers in obtaining fees from those whose parents can afford them?—We encourage the teacher so far as leaving the fees to himself as a remuneration, but we would certainly object most strongly to the teacher enforcing these fees in such a way as to interfere with the working of the school, or keep any child away for want of paying his weekly penny. I have a retainer here of the fees for one of the quarters of this year, and they are really vastly worth maintaining, considering the number of the pupils. One of my schools has somewhere about 250 children in daily attendance for the quarter, yet the school fees are not more than £2 5s. or £2 10s.

22946. Do you think it desirable that the schoolmaster should be paid in part according to the progress made by the children after examination, in some such way as what is called payment by results in England?—So far as the teacher is concerned—if it would give him a better remuneration than at present—I certainly would desire it, though I can't say I ever looked into the question under that point of view. The advantages of requiring into and passing judgment on the condition and working of a school, by results is a matter I had more or less under consideration; but in quite a different point of view than as bearing on the mere payment of the master. Under this view I have never gone into the system, nor considered how it would work in detail; but I suppose it is quite possible to devise some complex system provided with checks and counter-checks, which would increase or reduce to a fair and suitable amount a sum which otherwise, that is, if allocated on a simple principle exclusively, would be found insufficient or excessive. I do not know if I have explained myself sufficiently on this matter.

22947. Do you think the amount of local contributions given to schools in Ireland is satisfactory?—Well, on many points of view, to me it appears very satisfactory. I would be glad to see the people, or the body to which each school belonged, able to contribute very largely indeed, because I think it would render the schools more independent of Government control and less dependent on an external element than they are at present; but, at the same time, we must take the state of the country into consideration. The people, who contribute the extra payment for our schools, are very heavily taxed, not only for social and public purposes but also for the support of their own clergy; in fact, everything that is done, whether building schools and churches, or supporting their clergymen, is done by the voluntary contribu-

tions of the people; so that, under all the circumstances and speaking from my knowledge of my own parish, I think the people contribute very fairly towards the support of the schools.

22948. Do you think that if it were found expedient to increase the teachers' salaries it would be desirable to raise some part of such addition by a local rate?—I am not sufficiently versed in public matters to give my opinion on the practical bearing of that question. As far as I have an opinion on such matters I am very much in favour of local government of every kind. I think the people themselves know best what is wanted in their immediate locality, and take more interest in it. Whether it would have other bearings I do not exactly see at the present moment, and I do not like to give a general opinion on the subject. I often have thought of it as a possible and feasible way of getting rid of a great many of the difficulties of the question of the amount given by the State, by Government or from external sources, went more or less concentrated from the locality and under local control.

22949. If a local aid were raised should you consider that it ought to be raised like the poor-rates—partly from the owner and partly from the occupier?—Well, really, I don't know. I think, as a rule, everything in the long run comes out of the land, or is the product of personal industry. I think one way or other the owner of a house, the owner of a property, or the owner of a farm will get as much as he can for his house, land, or farm which he sets, and if he pays part of the taxes himself, it comes out of the land or the industry of the occupier in the long run, so that whoever paid it in the first instance it would not alter the matter very much. I would always like, however, that the payment of the schoolmaster should be brought home, as near as possible, to the people who have a direct interest in the school. For instance, the owners of the property where I live are principally large landed proprietors, who are not Roman Catholics, and I think it would be more reasonable and more congruous if the Roman Catholics themselves supported their schools, and in that way the appeal being made to the occupier and not to the owner would, perhaps, be preferable; but, as I said, I don't think it matters much so far as paying the tenant or actual occupier is concerned, because in the long run it comes from the land or the industry of the occupier, the tenant pays for support of himself and family and other necessary expenses, and all he can spare beyond that he gives in the shape of rent to the landlord.

22950. Have you any experience of model schools?—No, my lord, I have never come into personal contact with any of them.

22951. What are the principal grounds on which the Roman Catholic authorities object to the model or training schools at present?—I think they object to them, in the first place, because they are more necessary and from their conviction, so to speak, connected with the Board than the other schools, they are all the property of the National Board; they are all governed more directly and immediately by the National Board; the appointments in them altogether rest with the authorities of the National Board, and on account of the fact, whether it is intended or not, that these schools are frequented by a higher class of people, the theory, so to speak, or the principle of mixed education, comes into more real operation, or is likely to come into more real operation in the model schools than in the ordinary schools. I suppose there are a great many other reasons that may in the course of the examination suggest themselves to me; but these have struck me, at the present moment, as the most obvious. The control of the ecclesiastical authorities is little or none—none at all in fact of a direct character—over the model schools.

22952. As regards the ordinary pupils of the model schools—not looking on them as places for training teachers—are you opposed to mixed education of that class?—Certainly.

22953. As regards the teachers, who are trained in

these model schools, are you opposed to mixed education?—Yes. I think that it is, if possible, even more important that the teachers should be trained denominationally than the children of the lower classes who are afterwards subjected to their training.

22954. Are there any particular changes which are desired by the Roman Catholic authorities in the present management of the ordinary schools?—Of course I can only speak for myself or rather from my own knowledge of what the ecclesiastical authorities wish; but I think they are very much discontented with the present state of the ordinary schools, the restrictions that are imposed on the religious teaching in them, and their general condition. They certainly would wish to have the schools recognised by the Government or National Board as being in theory what they are in reality—denominational schools.

22955. I think you mentioned that in your schools, which are practically denominational, the rules of the Board created very little impediment to your teaching?—Very little impediment to our teaching generally—so far I intend my answer to apply. We have, in the schools I frequent, abundant opportunity for saying out that part of mental, or rather moral training which consists in devoting a certain amount of time to religious instruction of a very superior and unexceptionable quality, and so far it is true that I am not impeded at all in my schools; but there is more, a great deal more, that we look upon as necessary, quite as essential as the mere matter of religious teaching. We consider that religion should be instilled into the mind by practical exercises as well as by theoretical instruction—that religious training consists to a great extent of religious practices, which, though they may be small and almost unobservable, are interwoven with by the rules of the Board. These would not be interfered with if the schools were denominational, and if the opinion of the Inspector were delivered merely on the results, and the schools continued or ceased according to the amount of secular education imparted. I would have the Inspector report on the actual progress made in the school, without obliging him to inquire what the children were doing from morning till night. At present a great portion of the Inspector's time is taken up in objectionable and offensive inquiries—whether this or that small religious observance during school-hours is an infraction of the rules—whether they occur at such times or are of such a nature as to prevent Protestants from coming to the school and getting the benefits of the secular education imparted. Such questions, in my opinion, do more harm than good. They are annoying and troublesome, useless, because, as a matter of fact, there are no Protestants there; and they are merely worrying the teachers, and, as far as these questions penetrate down to the pupils, they create unpleasant impressions on their minds, which, I think, might be avoided if the Inspector merely reported on the results of the secular teaching in the school.

22956. Can you suggest any change which would leave the Roman Catholics more at liberty in their teaching and yet would preserve to Protestants in those places where a Protestant school cannot be maintained, access to schools for secular education, leaving in mind also the strong desire always shown in Parliament to protect religious minorities?—It all depends on the point you start from. If you take as your starting point that Protestants must attend a Roman Catholic school, or vice versa, of course I or any person of ordinary sense could suggest a great many things that would be less oppressive on the conscience and religious principles of the majorities than what exists at present; but, at the same time, I must say I am altogether and conscientiously an upholder of the principle of denominational education, and I consider the other principle perfectly unworkable and inadmissible.

22957. Are there many places in the north of Ireland where Roman Catholics would be unable to maintain a school for themselves?—I have no very accurate knowledge of the state of any part of the country, except that with which I am immediately concerned;

but, so far as I have learned from others there are few places in the north where the Catholics could not shift for themselves.

22958. Do you think there are many places in the south where Protestants could not shift for themselves?—I am quite certain they are very well able to take care of themselves everywhere.

22959. Then practically is it your opinion that it is not a matter of very grave necessity to provide for minorities?—As far as my own local knowledge goes, it really appears to be more or less ridiculous in point of fact, and would push to very ridiculous conclusions in point of logic for a system to be upheld which exists merely in theory and not in practice. I have seen a return showing that in Dublin we have attending schools under Roman Catholic or clerical management, 24,000 children, in the year 1846, and out of all that number there were not more than six or seven Protestants, and I believe four out of those six so called Protestants were Jews.

22960. Master Brooke.—Is that in the city of Dublin?—Yes.

22961. Does it take in the suburbs, Blackrock or Booterstown?—No, the city merely.

22962. The *Gleaner*.—Are you aware that in England the Roman Catholic schools under the Commission of the Privy Council are examined by an Inspector singly in secular matters?—I believe that is the rule, and that, even though he must be necessarily of the same religious persuasion as the patron or the children of the school, he is not allowed to ask any question connected with religious matters.

22963. Do you think a similar arrangement would work well in Ireland?—Of course when you speak of an arrangement, a person should have the whole plan before him before he could pronounce how it would work; but, at the moment, I see no objection to that arrangement. On the contrary, I think it would be very desirable that the religious inspection should be conducted by persons having the confidence of whatever religious community the school belongs to, and that the secular education should be under the control of the Inspector.

22964. If a system such as that should be established in Ireland, under which the Inspector would examine only into secular instruction, would you think it necessary that the Inspector should be denominational?—I think in all cases it would smother matters very much. An Inspector who does not belong to the denomination of the school he has to inspect is liable to mistakes—he is liable to misconstrue matters which he notices, and may possibly be led into great misapprehensions, and sometimes great misrepresentations of what comes under his observation. I think it is most desirable in that point of view that he should be of the same persuasion as the school he is inspecting.

22965. Have you fixed the style or mode of examination in your existing National schools, viz. as it all according to whether the Inspector is a Roman Catholic or a Protestant?—Well, I do not see a rule go to the schools while the Inspector is examining. Other clergymen do so, but I have particular reasons of my own for not attending on those occasions. I hold strong views on the whole subject of education. My position obliges me also to let nothing pass that requires to be rectified, and this would bring me perhaps into disagreeable collision with the Inspector or the Board if I were always present. When I hear what is done I pass judgment on it, and if I find anything not exactly as I think it should be I take means to have it rectified, but as a rule I do not go to the schools when the Inspector is present examining.

22966. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Speaking of the teachers whom you know, do you regard them as efficient?—Well, my teachers are some of them members of religious communities and some of them are secular teachers.

22967. May I ask first are all the female teachers of your school religious?—No.

22968. Evidently of them what is your opinion of the lay teachers male and female as to efficiency?—I

Dec. 4, 1846.

Very Rev.  
Monseigneur  
Levesque  
Ferdin., &c.,  
&c.

Dec. 8, 1893

Very Rev.  
Messrs.  
Lawrence  
Ferdin., &c.,  
&c.

always try to get the best I can, and I must say I have no fault to find with them—they do their business very well.

22969. Where do you get the male teachers?—Two of them I may say I did not get at all; I found them in the parish before me. Two more came since I came to the parish; I advertised for them. One of the gentlemen that I got, which he came to me to Blackrock school, was not at all in connexion with the Board. I believe he had been more or less in training in his time but had severed his connexion with them. I find him a very efficient teacher.

22970. What is their classification?—Do you speak of the teachers I engaged myself, or all of them?

22971. All of them?—One of my teachers is first of first class, another of them is I think the same. He is certainly first class; I do not know whether he is second or first of first—I scarcely think he is first because I don't think his salary is more than £44 a year, and I believe first of first class obtains a higher salary than that, but I know he has been studying and improved his classification since he came to me. The other teacher has a lower classification—I fancy he is either third of first, or first of second.

22972. Then your teachers are all high class teachers?—All high class, except one teacher whom I got six or eight months ago, and found highly efficient and successful. When he came to me I think he was first of third class, and that he became second class afterwards. He is now first of second.

22973. Which do you prefer, a high or low class teacher?—Well, all my teachers are very efficient, and I must say I don't object to any low class teacher any more than to the higher class. A good deal depends on the personal condition of the school and on the class of pupils that attend it. If a school has for a long time engaged a teacher of high classification, who takes an interest in his work and advances the boys, I think it would be an injury to such a school to take away the high class teacher and give them one of a lower qualification; whereas a school which has for some time been in a backward state and from other circumstances not so efficiently carried on as other schools—the master for instance being changed frequently, looking perhaps for a better place on account of the smallness of the population not furnishing a sufficient salary or for other reasons—I think under such circumstances a lower class teacher, if otherwise competent and industrious, would perhaps be more efficient than one of a higher qualification.

22974. *Gratia pariter* and viewed just as teachers, which would you prefer—a first or third class teacher?—Well, I always like to get the best article I can. If the first class teacher does not suit—if he does not answer my requirements, it is easier to get a second class teacher in his place than it would be if a second class teacher did not suit to procure a first class teacher in his place—so I always try and get the best I can.

22975. The parents of the children as a rule pay a very small amount of fees?—Very small.

22976. Can you say what number of children attend all your schools?—The exact numbers I cannot state—I can state the percentages of attendance.

22977. Do you know the numbers on the rolls of your schools?—I did not bring with me the memoranda giving the numbers. I have merely got the percentages of attendance. In the Dundrum male school for instance, we have an attendance of 71 per cent.; while the number actually in the school from my knowledge of it varies from 80 to 90, and sometimes goes up as far as 105, and close on 100, and as these numbers represent 71 per cent. of the number on the roll, I may not be far wrong in giving about 110 as the number on the rolls of that school. In the female school in the same place only 62 per cent. attend. In Booterstown male school, though I have the best and highest class teacher I find he is only able to bring up the attendance to 57 per cent. In the same way Blackrock male school, though having a high class teacher is only able to show an attendance of 42 per cent., while the female schools being conducted by

religieuses are able to bring 86 and 74 per cent. respectively of their pupils to the schools. I have a school that is not at all under the Board and I have an attendance of 200—it may be 210 or 220 in summer, and 250 in winter—and nearly every one of the children is in permanent daily attendance.

22978. Referring to the schools taught by male teachers, how can you account for the diminished attendance in some compared to others?—I really do not know. I am not a very acute thinker of conclusions from facts; but if I would venture a surmise, it would be that in a suburban district which is very much frequented in summer, and not so much in winter, there is a good deal of opportunity for children getting small employment, which varies very much with the number of visitors. I think the result is that the children get bad habits; they would rather earn 6d., 4d., or 3d. a day than go to school, and that gives them the habit of absenting themselves frequently, and then when the visitors go away, the bad habit acquired during the summer continues during the winter.

22979. Do you think as a general rule the parents would, for the sake of the children, appreciate education more if they paid school fees?—All I can say is, that in the school I have referred to in my parish, which is conducted altogether by religious ladies without any connexion with the Board, the constant permanent attendance varies very little from the number on the roll, and ranges from 200 in winter to 210 or 220 in summer. Nearly every pupil is in constant daily attendance and the ladies are not only very rigid in exacting the fees, but also very rigid in fining the children for occasional absence; in fact they would not allow a child who has remained away a day or two from school to return without paying a fine of 6d. I need not say that this is done, not with the idea of making money from the school, because the religious spend more money on the school than anything they could possibly get by it, and everything got in the school goes towards the support of it. I believe that people will value more the education which they pay for than that which they get gratuitously.

22980. To what religious order do those ladies belong?—The order of the Sacred Heart.

22981. What is the highest amount of fees received by them from the children?—The amount of fees goes up to about £10 a year.

22982. I mean the amount for each child?—The lowest is 1d. They vary according to the scale of education they are getting.

22983. Are there any so high as 5s. a quarter?—Oh, nothing like 5s. a quarter, probably at most 2s. 2d. a quarter, at 3d. a week.

22984. From your experience with regard to schools conducted by ladies, would you say that education would be better appreciated generally by the community if the parents of the children paid for this education, more or less?—I think in a matter of that kind results are brought about by a variety of means. I should say myself that the school leader to be practically better conducted, and gives a better education, and I think is appreciated in the district.

22985. I wish you to answer, not conveyed in relationship to any particular school, but as a general principle, do you think education would be more appreciated if parents usually paid school fees?—All I can say is, that it is a popular saying amongst managers of schools, and many parents and clergymen say so also, but I really have not studied it much.

22986. Do you think it would be promotive, for instance, of a better attendance?—I think that would depend very much on the character of the population. My most populous schools are in the neighbourhood of Blackrock. If you were to try to exact school fees there, where the population is very poor, you would shut up the schools, or at all events reduce the number to about one-third. Besides, I fancy there is an impression abroad—I consider my observation justified by the results even in my own parish—there is an impression abroad amongst our people that if the State pays for anything they, the people, ought not to pay. That

Dec 4, 1886

Very Rev.  
Messrs. Lawrence  
Fryde, &c.,  
&c.

idea is, I think, shared very much among the poor. They look on the schools as subsidised by the State, and that they are not called on to pay anything in addition.

22987. I infer from what you have said that in your districts there is a considerable variety in the social standing of the parents of the children?—A good deal. There is a great deal of poverty in one district, that of Blackrock; the other districts I do not think are so variable.

22988. Dundrum is in your district?—Dundrum is in my district, and there certainly there is not so much poverty, but it arises from local circumstances, the district is more rural in its character, the people of it are more comfortably circumstanced than in other places where there is much more poverty.

22989. Are there any children of parents whom you would call fairly off, in attendance at your schools?—No; I should say none at all almost.

22990. Any children of respectable shopkeepers?—Very few.

22991. You have some of these, I presume, at Dundrum?—No, the only instances I know of are principally about Booterstown. There are two or three there that if there was a moderate school pay-school in the neighbourhood would probably go to it.

22992. You have said that you encouraged the teacher to get as large an amount of school fees as possible. What is the character of the encouragement?—I did not say I encouraged the teacher to get as large an amount as possible. I said as far as allowing the teacher to keep the fees was an encouragement I encouraged him to do so. On the contrary, we very often, both myself and the assistant clergyman—not rebuke, because we have no occasion to do so—but suggest to the teacher to admit children gratuitously where there is any difficulty at all about the payment, and from the returns I have here, the vast majority of the children are educated without any payment at all.

22993. The character of the encouragement is permission to the teacher to take moderate fees where the parents can afford to pay them?—Yes, I am told that in many places the managers themselves appropriate the fees and pay them out again as part of their remunerated payment to the teacher, or expend them in paying for school requisites or improving the accommodation of the school. We do not do that. We allow the teacher to appropriate the fees.

22994. Are the managers with whom you are acquainted in the habit of taking any practical steps to encourage the parents to pay school fees?—I should say not, at least I am not aware that they take any steps to encourage them to pay fees; the great object is to encourage parents to send their children to the school. The question of the fees I think they rather leave altogether to the pupil and the master.

22995. In answer to the Chairman's question, with regard to education in the north, you said there were few places where the Roman Catholic minorities could not shift for themselves; what is the character of the shifting that would satisfy you?—I mean to say that if we had a denominational system in place of the present system, I am pretty certain the zeal of the Catholic clergy for the proper education of the children committed to their care, and the zeal of the people in receiving them—in fact the conscientious obligation they would feel to provide education for them—would ensure their getting a school sufficient to warrant their receiving a subsidy from the Board.

22996. What size of school as to attendance of scholars do you think would warrant a subsidy?—I don't know. I don't think the question would arise so far as the Roman Catholics are concerned in any part of Ireland, because there is no part of Ireland, north, south, east, or west, where there is not quite a sufficient Catholic population to give a very sufficient attendance for a well conducted school.

22997. What would you say would be a sufficient attendance?—I am not saying now what would be a merely sufficient attendance to warrant a subsidy in

case of extreme necessity, but I think a school of thirty-five or forty ought to be a very good school, and with a school of that kind there need be no scruple whatever in awarding a subsidy. In that sense I say the Catholics would certainly be able to shift for themselves, for they would always be able to get up a sufficient number to entitle them to a subsidy from the State.

22998. Would you not say there would be little necessity for shifting, in fact no such element in the case, if there were thirty-five children in the school?—I am not aware that I used the word shifting. I don't know whether it was I introduced the word, or whether the noble Chairman introduced it; but I certainly never contemplated that it would be at all necessary for the Catholics to make an extraordinary effort in any part of Ireland in order to get up a school under the denominational system. Viewing the question in the abstract—and supposing the case of even a very small minority of Catholic children—if you could imagine a locality in the north of Ireland, which I don't believe exists, in which there were not more than ten or twelve Catholic children, and where the State would say "we will not give a subsidy to so small a number," the tendency of my observations is this, that I should be very well inclined to leave the twelve children in that locality to the real and conscientious exertions of the local clergyman and take the denominational system for the whole of Ireland, because I am sure that in the very few exceptional cases—if such there were—the children would be perfectly safe in receiving a good education, and that they would be secured from the danger of frequenting a school not of their own persuasion, by the real, activity, and watchfulness of the local clergyman.

22999. Considering the amount of clerical duty to be discharged by the local clergyman, irrespective of school teaching, or looking after children in the schools, do you think where the people are so scattered he could give sufficient attendance to those children?—I think it would all depend upon the manner in which from the circumstances of the place the question would present itself to the mind of the local clergyman. If from the circumstances of the place it became a matter of leading importance, and of leading necessity with him, I am certain the clergyman would work the matter up and secure the children from going to a school where their faith would be in the least imperilled.—I am quite sure of that.

23000. Viewing this matter under any circumstances would such a case involve the necessity of those children going to a Protestant school under a Protestant teacher?—I was pointing out that that is the danger the Catholic clergyman would have to guard against. For instance, if the State refused a school for eight or nine children of the Roman Catholic persuasion, there would be no obvious danger that they would fit want of a Catholic school be placed in the temptation of going to a denominational school of another persuasion. The tendency of my observations is, that I would feel perfectly safe in relying on the zeal of the clergyman as a guarantee against that result.

23001. Do you mean that he should prevent their attending a school under a Protestant teacher?—Oh, certainly, that is what I mean.

23002. As a matter of fact do you know much of the North of Ireland—for instance, the counties of Antrim and Down?—No. I have already said I know very little of them.

23003. Would you be surprised to learn that the Roman Catholic bishop of that district has acknowledged that there is a considerable number of such Roman Catholic minorities as I have alluded to?—I really do not know. I do not wish to make any observation on what any person, especially one in a higher station than myself, may have said on a subject of that kind.

23004. You know Mr. Kavanagh, I presume?—I know there is such a gentleman.

23005. May I ask did you hear he was lately in the North of Ireland investigating the matter of Catholic minorities and the management of schools?

Dec. 8, 1868.  
Very Rev.  
Messrs.  
Lawrence  
Furness, &c.,  
&c.

generally—I heard it incidentally, as a part of another matter which came under conversation—not as a thing in which I was concerned in any way, or in which I was supposed to be interested in the least.

23006. Taking one instance which be mentioned in the county of Antrim, be stated that in all the schools round about Ballymena, and distant from it one mile, two miles, and even taking a circle of four miles, there were very small Catholic minorities, in some cases three or four or at the outside six children; that taking Ballymena as a centre the schools radiating from it in all directions to a distance of four miles, including Bessborough, Corry, and Cullybacky, were attended by Catholic minorities of three, four, or at most six children—what provision would you make for Catholic children so circumstanced—do you think it possible a clergyman could provide for them?—Well, I must decline following the examiner into questions of locality, and names I really know nothing about—I am quite sure I should be able to devise some means if I were sufficiently aware of the locality and circumstances of the place; I would do the best I could, but I must decline giving an opinion on what does not at all concern me.

23007. If such cases instead of being few were in the northern counties very numerous, would not that have the effect of making your position more difficult still?—I don't admit that I should be in a difficult position at all. I have already said I am not sufficiently aware of all the circumstances of the case. If you take one element out of a case and present that element alone to us, you may of course make it very difficult to pass an opinion upon it that would be at all in harmony with the views you hold on the general subject, whereas if a person interested in carrying out his own views on the matter, had the whole case before him, and not one isolated element of it, he might be able to show a very appropriate way in which his principle or view might be applied.

23008. With regard to the model schools, you have stated that the opposition of the bishops to them is owing to the fact of their being more immediately connected with the Board?—With the Commissioners of Education; perhaps I should have expressed myself more strongly than saying they are more immediately connected with the Board.

23009. In what way are they more immediately connected with the Board?—For instance, they are the property of the Board, and vested in the Board; they are governed by the Board, the Board is the patron of them. The result of that is, that all the modifying influences that the local managers and patrons, who are not the Board, exercise in eliminating or neutralizing what I believe to be the essential evils of the mixed system are not applicable in the model schools, whereas they are elsewhere.

23010. Are the clergy of your Church very busy in eliminating the matters to which you refer, and which you consider wrong in the mixed system?—I don't know exactly what you mean by the phrase “very busy,” they visit over the schools, they have a constant and almost daily one of the schools when they are conveniently situated, and I know some of them are very near the clergyman's residence, or near the church, and I am quite sure that, without being what you call “very busy,” they do manage to eliminate the evils of the mixed system to a considerable extent. It is not such a difficult thing as you may imagine to eliminate its evils where the schools are practically denominational.

23011. What are the evils?—The evils are, that where you have a mixed system you cannot recognise any religion. I think education must be based on religion and on the recognition of it. Mixed education is not only conducted without religious instruction, but without the religious practical element being introduced into it, and I am quite sure that system of education is injurious. The clergy eliminate these particular evils almost completely.

23012. In what way?—By having the schools denominational in reality.

23013. Do you mean to say they make any effort to exclude children of other denominations?—No; there is no such effort necessary, because the clergy of other denominations are, I suppose, just as anxious to have the children of their congregations under their control as we are.

23014. In managing the schools do they observe the rules of the Board?—I can only answer for myself, that I observe the rules of the Board. However, I must say that I observe them, stretching them at the utmost extent I can, in favour of religious education. If I were to observe the rules strictly, viewing them as I view them, I would not allow nuns into my school; for I think their presence is an infraction of the rules of the Board.

23015. Are not the rules governing the model schools precisely similar to the rules under which ordinary National schools are managed?—I have stated to his lordship that I have come very little in contact with the model schools, so that I can speak very little from personal acquaintance with them, but I think in the matters I have pointed out they decidedly are not. For instance, in the case I contemplate, the parish priest is patron of his schools and owner of them, as such he can appoint the religious instruction he believes in himself, and in which he is bound to instruct the children under his care. In the model schools the Board take no care at all of that. I think, therefore, it makes a great deal of difference whether the Board is the patron or whether I am patron. It also makes a difference whether I am owner of the school; for, if I am owner, whatever I do, I do it with the consciousness that I am owner, and that at any time the Board interfere with me in the management I can exclude them, and take the care of my own school.

23016. As owner of your schools would you consider yourself bound to admit a Protestant minister of any denomination, to give instruction to a small Protestant minority?—I will give you my own opinion merely, on a matter which, I believe, is one of practice, and, therefore, apart from a question of principle, you will find persons, according to the circumstances of each locality, inclined to give different opinions. My own opinion is this: so fully am I convinced of the necessity of denominational education that I would not have anything to say to a school in which a clergyman of another persuasion was allowed to give religious instruction. I would not have that spectacle placed before the children of whom I had spiritual charge. I think it would be a most injurious practical lesson to give them.

23017. Shall we take it you are opposed to the vested system?—Most certainly. I dare not be anything else. It is my duty as a Roman Catholic clergyman to keep my schools under my own control and in my own possession. In fact, it is the strength of our position. If we gave up that point we might transfer the education of the children altogether into the hands of the State.

23018. Can you state how many vested schools altogether are in the hands of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity in Ireland?—I do not know, but I believe a very small proportion—probably about one-sixth of them.

23019. You don't object, I presume, to either clergy or laity of other denominations being patrons and managers of non-vested schools?—That would depend altogether on the circumstances in which I was placed; for instance, I should be very sorry that a Church of England or Presbyterian clergyman should be patron or manager of my schools, but I have not the smallest objection to their managing their own.

23020. You have no objection to their being patrons and managers of their own schools?—None whatever.

23021. With reference to the model schools, one of your objections is that the appointments rest with the authorities. Who are the authorities?—I take it the Board.

23022. On what principle do you object to the Commissioners of Education being themselves the patrons and managers of a few schools in the country?

—I think the question is altered by your putting it in that form—"patrons and managers of a few schools." If there were merely a few schools like other ordinary schools, the question is one thing; but if you add the words, "a few schools, being model schools," it makes a very great difference. I think the model schools being intended to be the principal schools in the country, any objection which at all applies to the Board or the State educating the people, applies with still more force to these schools, therefore, any objection I had on the subject at all would be principally to the model schools. I would not call them a few schools; I would call them, if they could be brought into one the principal schools in the country.

23012. As a matter of fact, in those appointments have not the Commissioners of Education dealt very fairly towards all parties?—Do you speak of the appointments in the model schools?

23013. Yes; I speak of the appointments in the model schools to which you referred as one ground of your objection?—I view the appointments as practically vested in an authority in which I have no confidence. As to what appointments they have made, that is a matter of fact, and I have already stated that I am really not conversant with the appointments they have made. I believe, however—at least I have no reason to disbelieve what I have heard—that there is one most objectionable feature in the appointments. They take very good care always to put over the infant school, even where the children are principally Roman Catholics, a Protestant or a Presbyterian mistress. I think that is most objectionable and unfair.

23014. Can you say how many model schools there are in the country?—I do not know. They are a class of schools I have come very little into contact with.

23015. Can you say how many Presbyterian head teachers there are in the model schools of the country?—I speak of the head teachers of the infant schools.

23016. As a matter of fact, have not the Commissioners, in appointing teachers of different religions, been exceedingly generous towards the Roman Catholic denomination?—Speaking to a Commissioner of Education, I am, of course, not so conversant with the details of the matter as he is. I must say, however, it is believed they have not been; the public opinion is that they have not.

23017. You are not acquainted with the statistics, I presume?—No.

23018. With regard to model schools, you are aware, I presume, of the opposition of the bishops to them?—Certainly.

23019. And the pastoral of the bishops?—Yes.

23020. I see that the Bishop of Galway issued a pastoral on January 3rd, 1865, in reference to the model schools at Galway, where he says—"While we feel in justice bound to say that we would not on any account be understood as conveying any censure on the personal conduct of the Catholics of either sex employed in the teaching department of the model school—nor, indeed, does the consideration of their personal good or bad qualities affect in any way the merits of the case—we cannot too strongly reprobate the principle of placing infant Catholic children under the charge of a Presbyterian mistress, whose presence and teaching, even without the slightest intention on her part, must be ever calculated to instil into their susceptible minds a spirit of religious indifference." Am I to take it that you concur in that sentiment?—I have already stated that I do not wish to pronounce any opinion at all—in fact, I made it a rule with myself when coming into this room to decline, as far as I am allowed to do so, giving any opinion—on the acts or words of the bishops of the country. They can answer for themselves; and as for the individual statements or facts they may refer to in their pastorals, or their evidence, as the case may be, they know all the circumstances of the case under which they speak. To affirmate a passage from a pastoral, or to select a sentence from a bishop's evidence, and ask a person his opinion on that, is simply asking an opinion of an isolated circumstance, without giving the party an

opportunity of duly weighing the whole matter which the prelate may have had in his mind. On this principle I wish to be allowed to decline giving any opinion on the acts and words of my superiors. If you wish for my opinion on any subject, put it in a distinct way, and I will give it, as far as it is worth having, on any matter you wish to ask me.

23021. You have referred to Presbyterian tenders in model schools. Do you think such a statement as this by the bishop is fair towards any such teacher?—Nor can we conceive how any Catholic mother possessed of a particle of religious faith, of well-regulated feeling, of maternal love, or with any regard for their future happiness—since a female without religion is but a moral monster, a pest and scourge of society—could for a moment hesitate to withdraw her infant daughters from such unholy influences and place them under the charge of these consecrated spouses of Christ, where not alone the principles inculcated upon them and the edifying example they beheld, but the very religious atmosphere they inhale is replete of virtue and female purity. Should you regard this language as justifiable towards the teacher, simply on the ground of her being of a different faith?—I am sure the bishop will answer for himself, if asked. I have already declined respectfully to do so.

23022. What is the opinion of the Roman Catholic clergy as to the National system of education?—My opinion is that the clergy, so far as I am acquainted with them, agree thoroughly with myself. I am not here as representing them; I am here to give my own opinion; but so far as I know them, they consider that it is a system founded on an unsound principle, and that if it could be carried into effect in the way intended by its originator, I believe the present Lord Derby, that the mixed system of education, would uproot the Catholic religion in this country, and substitute indifference in its stead.

23023. Should we understand from your answer that there are a number of the clergy of a different opinion?—I am not aware that I have said anything to that effect.

23024. You are not aware that in many dioceses many of the clergy are opposed to the bishops?—I am not at all aware of it. I am perfectly sure they are not opposed to the bishops. The position which the clergy and bishops have taken up is perfectly clear and intelligible, without supposing that any one differs from the other in their view of the principles bearing on the subject. They accept the fact based on them as an experiment—not exactly, in my opinion, as an experiment, for I think there never was such a test to prove what I am conversant of, namely, that the system is unsound, and founded on unsound doctrinal principles, so that I do not even look on it as an experiment,—but as a necessity.

23025. After parish priests are appointed I believe they are to a large extent independent of the bishop with regard to removal—not removable as curates are?—As far as the mere matter of their not being removable at the mere will of the bishop, or for reasons of general policy connected with the diocese, there is that difference.

23026. I believe the curate of each parish clergyman is not of his own selection or appointment?—Well, practically he generally is, at least I speak of this diocese. If a parish priest wishes for the assistance of a particular clergyman as his curate, and the latter wish to serve in that particular parish, the arrangement would generally be ratified by the archbishop; at the same time the bishops have the appointment—it vests in the bishops.

23027. The appointment of the curate in the different parishes is vested in the bishops by law?—Yes, by the ecclesiastical law of this country it is.

23028. Have you heard that in many cases the Roman Catholic clergyman and his curate held opposite views on the subject of education?—Certainly not in many cases. I have not heard of any case, in fact. The whole difference on the subject would always be a difference within the proper limits of the respect an inferior would have to a superior, and the

Dec. 6, 1865.  
Very Rev  
Messrs  
Lawrence  
Ford, &c.,  
&c.

Dec 8, 1892

Very Rev  
Bishop of  
Limerick  
Dublin, E.E.  
V.S.

respect and gentleman would have to another—it would only regard the practical expediency of introducing a school in a certain locality. It is quite possible a parish priest might have such strong views on the subject of the abstract dangers of the system that he would not allow a National school into his parish at all, while his conscience might say, not in remembrance even, but as matter of conversation—"Well, really, after all, where the population is altogether Catholic, where you are sure to be patron of the school yourself, where you can direct and superintend the religious instruction, where you can withdraw your connexion with the Board at any time they interfere with you, and where you can have the school practically a denominational school, with the mere drawback of being obliged to use certain books, my opinion is you might waive the matter of principle for the time being, and in consideration of your inability to take the more expensive system—say of the Christian Brothers—that you might try the experiment of the National school in your parish." Possibly a curate might speak in that way to his parish priest, or vice versa, but that would not involve the least difference of opinion on the merits of the system.

23040. Have you not heard of many parishes in which the curate adopts the views of the bishop, and the parish priest upholds the mixed system, and approves of it?—I have not, and excuse me if I make no observation: I think that is perfectly beside the question we are discussing at the present moment. It appears to me I have already stated that, as far as the outward external facts are concerned, there may appear to be differences of opinion not only between parish priest and curate, but between different members of the hierarchy on the subject. I have also said that the position of the bishops and clergy towards the National system—and I mean not only of the bishops and clergy in general, but of anyone in particular amongst them, is perfectly plain and intelligible without at all supposing that any of them approve or even less approved the principle of the mixed system of education.

23041. Are you not aware that in many dioceses, as far as they can, many of the laity are opposed to the bishops in matters of education?—I am not very well acquainted with the state of other dioceses. In this diocese I am not aware of any such difference of opinion.

23042. In whose interest was the present system of education, professing to be a united system, introduced?—Professing to be a united system, and with that element in it, it could scarcely be introduced as the interest of any religious body; but certainly as a practical measure, the National system being introduced at a time when the nearest elementary education had not been given in Ireland, or could not be had by Roman Catholics, except at great risk, if not the sacrifice of their religious principles, it certainly was at the time and to that extent a benefit to that particular religious persuasion. They were the poorest part of the community; they were the persons most exposed to temptation on the score of religion; they were the most destitute in the department of education before; they had kept away from the only sources of education which had previously been afforded them, at great temporal sacrifice for the sake of their religious convictions. The door was opened to them of the National system, which in three-fourths of Ireland was practically a denominational system, and so far they certainly received a benefit; I do not deny it.

23043. By practically denominational, what do you mean?—That is to say, the schools are not mixed.

23044. Would you be surprised to learn that in the National Board's Inspector's district of Limerick, out of seventy-six schools one-half are mixed, having children of different denominations?—I would be surprised at almost nothing I hear. At the same time I have said I do not know much of any district outside my own. Allow me at the same time to make a general observation, there is such a way of making up the reports and returns that a school may very often

appear to be a mixed school which is really not mixed at all. For instance, in my school, if the Inspector happened to come in where perhaps one Protestant might be on the roll of perhaps 100 boys—and when that boy might perhaps remain on the roll for only a quarter of a year, and, as really happened, not attend for more than four or five weeks—of the Inspector came during that time he would report it as a mixed school, but no one in his senses would call it a mixed school, nor is it such in reality.

23045. Would you regard a school in the Limerick district as mixed, where the majority of the children were Roman Catholics, with a few Episcopians, and a few Presbyterians, would you call that a mixed school?—I don't like to speak of any schools that I do not know myself.

23046. Are you aware that for several years after the introduction of the National system the Roman Catholic clergy and bishops approved and took advantage of it?—At the time it was introduced I was very young in my career, and I really cannot speak with accuracy on the matter. I believe, however, as a matter of fact and from all I have heard on the subject, that the Catholic prelates and clergy did avail themselves very extensively of the facilities given by getting grants; at the same time allow me to observe another thing with regard to the schools at this period, it is very generally believed, I cannot say with what truth, that the Board at that time was very anxious to extend its operations over the country, and was anything but rigorous in requiring the accurate fulfilment of what I call the abstract conditions of its support.

23047. Would you adopt the term applied by another witness to the Commissioners, that they are a "squashable body"?—I decline altogether to answer that question. The phrase is what you may call a cut one, and therefore a witness applying the word may apply it under a great variety of significations.

23048. Is it your idea that they were at least an easily influenced body at the time?—That is certainly my impression from what I heard.

23049. Have not your clergy still a large number of schools in connexion with the Board of Education?—Certainly, for instance, I have myself nine schools in my parish, eight of which are in connexion with the Board.

23050. Was the present Primarist once the parish priest of Drindalk?—You speak of the Archbishop of Armagh—he was; I know that as a matter of history.

23051. Are you not aware that he once testified that the laity of the Church with which he was connected were in favour of the National system of education?—Well, I don't know what the details of Dr. Keenan's evidence were. I believe he was examined in a Parliamentary inquiry, but throughout my career I have taken very little interest in the details, the facts, the various tests and inquiries made with regard to the system. I had my mind made up on the merits of the subject from the beginning of my career, that it was an untried system, and I cared very little for hearing or knowing the various attempts made to patch it up or alter it in one direction or another. With regard to the practical working of it as far as I came in contact with it, with the drawback of the books which I always of course had a strong objection to, I found it to be practically a denominational system.

23052. After all, your experience is limited?—Of course I said so from the commencement. Every man's personal experience is, of necessity, limited. I may add, however, that I am not very young in the ministry, and Vicar-General of the most populous diocese in Ireland, and that few ecclesiastics, not themselves members of the hierarchy, have a better opportunity in the ordinary course of life of hearing the opinions and views of leading ecclesiastics than I have.

23053. Mr. O'Shea—If the State paid a stipend to chaplains of the different denominations for each of the model schools, allowing the appointment of the chaplains of the Roman Catholic Church to the bishop of the diocese, so that persons approved of by him would have special charge of the religious instruction as well



Dec. 8, 1908.

Very Rev  
Missions  
Lawrence  
Ford, F.R.  
C.S.

of the people in the schools as of the teachers in training, at a particular hour set apart for religious instruction, would that go to any, and if so, to what extent to obviate your objections to the state of religious education in the model schools?—No; I am afraid it would go a very short way, if any; because, unless the system were radically and fundamentally reformed, unless those schools were, so to speak, in their substance and management, subversive to the religious body to which we belong, I think the chaplain would be looked on by many of us rather as a lure or a bait—if you could suppose a clergyman could occupy such a position—either than as any real advantage, because the influence of a chaplain, where he is put to administer a bad system is certainly very slight. His influence must be of a religious character, and the whole tendency of the system is to make religion a very secondary affair.

23054. Surely the presence of a minister of religion, having special duties to discharge with reference thereto, having to watch over the religious culture of the young men in the school, could not in any respect deteriorate the authority or weaken the influence of the religion that he teaches?—I think the effect would be to inspire a false confidence in many persons who are at present deterred from sending their children to those schools by reason of the condemnation of the bishops and clergy, and who would say, when they found a Roman Catholic chaplain appointed, "What harm would there be in going there?" If model schools were such bad places the bishops would not have appointed chaplains to them.

23055. You are aware that since those schools came under the special censure of the bishops there have not been Catholic clergy in attendance on them?—That is the case, I believe.

23056. Would you push your objection to the system as far as to say you would not consider it desirable that Protestants and Catholics should mingle together in the same school to learn the ordinary branches of necessary education, such as mathematics, or reading, writing, and arithmetic, it being specially provided, and special care being taken, that while they are so mingled together in mixed education, their religious principles shall not be tampered or interfered with?—I certainly think that when persons of different religions are brought together for what are looked upon as merely secular purposes, it involves the omission of a great deal of influence, which is much more necessary than any secular instruction, and that, therefore, it could not be done without a sacrifice of matters of much more importance.

23057. How are men to come together as members of the same State in shelter if they are taught in their early life that they must shun and avoid each other during the period in which young people are generally brought up in school together; and that during that time they are to be indoctrinated during the whole period with the express dogmatic teaching of a particular Church, how are they afterwards in the ordinary duties of life to mingle with each other, or they must do in a country like this, where there are people of opposite creeds?—As a matter of fact you find in social life in this country very little sympathy among the gentry and trading classes between persons of different religious persuasions. When their duties or interests in the various relations of social life bring them together they are found kind, civil, and polite to each other. I find, as far as my experience goes, that the more persons are educated in their own religion the more I find them on terms of kind and amiable intercourse with persons of a different religion, while, on the contrary, those who are at observing in their social intercourse the principles of the mixed system—being afraid of touching on each others toes, so to speak, are always uneasy and unpleasant, as a rule, when brought into contact in public life. As a matter of fact, our schools are disorganised in this country for all classes. A Roman Catholic gentleman, for instance, does not send his son to a mixed school when he can send him to an exclusively Roman Catholic

school, and, in the same way, no Protestant gentleman will send his son to a mixed school, if he can send him to a Protestant school. With all this there is no tendency that they must shun and avoid each other; it is simply taken as a matter of course that they are not to go to the same school any more than to the same house of worship; because next to the church the school has, and ought to have, the greatest influence in producing religious impressions.

23058. The State is the *parens patrie* while the father is *paterfamilias*. The duties of *parens patrie* and of the *paterfamilias* are two different things. Do you regard them in the same?—These are abstract propositions with regard to the functions of the State on which I offer no opinion.

23059. Do you insist that the duty of the State as *parens patrie* is the same as the duty of a *paterfamilias*?—I think the duty of the State is to interfere as little as possible with each man's individual rights. I am not very fond of the principle of giving anything like a predominant power or influence to the State at all. I think the less it interferes with the concerns of individuals the better. Let the State protect every person in his rights and then it will best discharge its duty as *parens patrie*.

23060. If a father desired to send his child to a mixed school should there be no protection afforded to that child, such as is afforded in the schools under the National Board—do you allow a parent to have the right to send his child to a mixed school if he prefers it?—When I referred to the practice of parents in the matter, I spoke of it as a matter of fact.

23061. I don't speak of it as a matter of fact at the present moment, but as a matter of opinion, I want to know whether you acknowledge the right of a parent to send his child to any school he likes?—I do not acknowledge the right of any person to do wrong.

23062. I am not putting it in that way—I want to know this—whether you acknowledge the right of a parent to send his child to any school that appears to him to be a suitable and proper school?—I really do not understand the question. If you ask me what I think the duty of a parent is I can tell it you.

23063. I cannot make it plainer to you?—Then I must adhere to my former answer, that I do not recognise the right of any person to do what is wrong.

23064. I am not assuming that the parent does what is wrong?—I state my opinion, that a parent does a wrong thing when he sends his child to a mixed school, if he can avoid doing it. If the school be conducted on unsectarian principles, whether religious, social, or political, or be otherwise a bad school, the parent simply makes a grave mistake in considering it a suitable school, and should be accountable, were he to insist on carrying his views into execution, to the control of the respective authority.

23065. You say he does wrong if he has an opportunity of sending his child to a Roman Catholic school, when he sends it elsewhere. I wish to know if he cannot send his child to a Roman Catholic school, is he wrong in sending it to another than a Roman Catholic school?—That must always be an individual question for the party himself.

23066. It arises out of your previous answer?—Yes, but in each case it must be a question for the individual. I should be sorry to say that peculiar circumstances may not arise in which it should be lawful for a parent to send a particular child to a particular school which happened to be a mixed, or even a Protestant school, for the attainment of a certain object, which was perhaps necessary for his career in life, and which could not be obtained elsewhere. I should be sorry to condemn any particular case that may arise, on general principle. Every case must be considered on its own merits. The general rule is, however, that it is wrong for parents to send children to schools where they cannot get religious education, and they cannot get it in mixed schools.

23067. Assuming that your views were adopted by the State, and that in all the National schools throughout the country there was pure denominationalism, that

Dec. 8, 1898.

Very Rev.  
Messrs.  
L. A. B. & P.,  
V.

the Roman Catholic schools would teach to the whole extent of the teaching of the church according to the doctrines of the Council of Trent, or any other standard of doctrine you could choose, and that the Protestant, both Episcopalian and Presbyterian, in the adjoining schools, or in the schools scattered over the country, teaches also his views as a part and a parcel of ordinary education, will not each school because as it were a particular "seminary" putting the word in no offensive sense—of the particular views and tenets of such denomination?—I cannot well understand what is meant by being a seminary of particular views.

23068. Well, a seminary?—As far as religion is concerned it is quite right it should be so, and I should be very sorry it should not be so. As far as particular views on social and public matters are concerned, I am not aware that there are any particular views peculiar to one denomination more than another.

23069. I am not speaking of social matters at all—I am speaking of distinctive religious opinions.—Certainly denominational school would be places where nothing but particular religious opinions would be taught, and so far they would be, if you like to call them so, seminaries of particular religious opinions, but I take it they would not be exclusively seminaries of religious opinions because there would be secular instruction at the same time.

23070. You would not think it right to give the secular instruction without the other?—I would not give secular instruction without giving the other. We draw a wide distinction between instruction and education. We do not think we discharge our duties as clergymen or religious educators by merely instructing the people. On the contrary we seek to work all the influences—some of them very notable and observable and some of them apparently rather influential from their constant use—all these influences we seek to work, of which the Roman Catholic church avails herself, in producing a good moral effect on her children. It is not a question of instruction—it is a question of religious influences—and we certainly would have our secular instruction accessible also to those religious influences. For instance, if in reading a passage of a book, an opportunity offered for the instructor to make a good moral remark, a good religious remark, it would be quite proper that he should be able to make it. Short prayers by which the children are taught to recollect themselves from time to time, and to recall the presence of Almighty God, requiring a small poem from studies, scarcely perceptible but very influential in forming the habits of the Roman Catholics—these and many other such things we insist on being, more or less according to the skill of the instructor and the persons having charge of the school, mixed up with the work of instruction whether religious or secular. It is not a question merely of instruction, it is a question of religious instruction and of secular instruction well mixed with religious influences.

23071. May there not be secular instruction availed with religious influences, and yet there not be distinctive dogmatic influences?—There is surely a religious influence we exercise that does not spring from a dogma or is not based on it, or which may not be based, in one shape or another, a question of dogma. If you question the propriety of it, you at once raise a dogmatic question—you raise it from the sphere of practice to that of dogma and theory.

23072. Are you acquainted with the Bridgewater Treatises?—No, I have heard of them—nothing more.

23073. You speak very favourably of infant schools, you think them a powerful agent in forming the minds of the young, so much so, that you would not allow any Presbyterian teacher to take charge of your infant school?—Certainly not.

23074. Do you think that a female Presbyterian teacher, having a box of lessons on objects in the school, having a good knowledge of natural history, and having a few objects of natural history would not be able to teach a good deal of the wisdom and goodness of God to a child without touching on anything that would

offer the most sensitive Roman Catholic?—I should not like the best trained teacher that ever issued from any school to undertake the task.

23075. I did not ask what you would do?—I am merely giving my answer. I would not, perhaps, any female teacher of a religion different from my own to undertake to teach on religion at all.

23076. Master Brooke.—You said that in Dublin, among the 24,000 children in Catholic National schools there were but six or eight Protestants altogether?—From six to ten. I cannot say for certain, but not more than ten.

23077. Does that hold good also in the eight schools you yourself have under the Board—have you any Protestants in them?—During the whole period of my connection with the schools we have had, to the best of my recollection, but four Protestants, and one of them I cannot say he stopped even a month in the school. Of the others, two stopped a long time in the school. I really don't know whether they are in it or not at present, as I have ceased to be manager of the school—but they received religious instruction from a Catholic mistress and of a Catholic character at the request of the parent. The fourth instance is that of a boy, who was, for a very short time, in a certain way attending his religion—that is to say, he was a Catholic, but he was afraid of his father knowing it. The mother came in and desired him to be registered as a Catholic. I believe the schoolmaster desisted, and asked instructions from one of the curates—the curate told him to act according to the regulations of the Board in the case and send the child out of the school. In a short time the father came and requested that the child might be taught to serve Mass, so that took the case out of the class of Protestant children altogether. The schoolmaster then directed the child to be sent to the school, during the six years I am connected with the schools—one of these left in about a month's time, and the other two got Catholic instruction.

23078. You did not send these two boys out?—They were two girls, I think. It was an infant school—a school of male and female infants. The mistress directed the attention of the parent to it at the time, who said she wished the children to get Catholic instruction, of course that put an end to the whole question.

23079. In schools where none but Roman Catholic children attend, I suppose you are at liberty to introduce the observances you have been speaking of?—I feel myself very much at liberty. Experience has shown me how far I can go; beyond that point I am not solicited to extend, because it would bring me into collision with the Board, up to that point I have no difficulty in carrying it on—it is the settled practice in the parish, not only as long as I have been there, but before.

23080. You have short prayers and ejaculations when the clock strikes, and things of that kind?—Yes.

23081. And that is the usual practice in the school?—It is.

23082. When the Protestant came into your school did you think it necessary to alter the arrangements?—I should distinguish between school and school. When the observances I have mentioned are best carried out, it is where the teachers are religious; because they set the example themselves, and the children get into the habit easily—in the secular schools they are not so much attended to. I don't think the question arose in the school where those children came.

23083. Of course those schools are open to any Protestant children who come to them?—Of course.

23084. Suppose four, five, or ten Protestant children came to one of these schools claiming secular instruction, would you consider yourself bound rigidly, during the time of such instruction, to abstain from any such observances?—I would consider myself bound to keep my bargain, and, of course, I would keep it—that is to say, if I get a grant on certain conditions, of course I would keep my bargain, but I would be very sorry to have to do it. If I had a school where there were ten Protestants and thirty or forty Catho-

has—though practically I do not find that Protestants come to the schools, for they do not like the aspect of a Catholic school, where the priest comes in and out as if the school was his own, and of course that prevents Protestant children from going there; just in the same way as Catholic children would not like going to a Protestant or Presbyterian clergyman's school—bes, if such a thing as that happened, I would not what was best to be done, and probably get up another school, for I would not have anything to say to a school as placed so as to deprive it of the character of a Catholic school.

23083. What is the hour of your special religious instruction in those schools?—It varies in different schools; generally twelve o'clock, I think.

23084. It is in the middle of the day, then?—Yes, in the middle of the day.

23085. In that case, if a Protestant child attended the school he would have to be turned out?—The case, as I have already said, has not arisen.

23086. You said there is one case?—Oh, that case has ceased to exist long ago. The one headless Protestant in the school left in about a month's time.

23087. While he remained at the school was he turned out every day?—I really do not know. I take it for granted that the rules were observed, because the master referred the matter to me at the time. It is four or five years since it happened, and I cannot remember every small circumstance of that kind; but I take it for granted I adhered to the rule I adopt, of observing any hegman I make—I know that I told the master to give the proper notice, so that the child might be looked after by the parent; and I am quite sure, as the master is a conscientious, upright man, very much esteemed by the Board as well as by myself—I am quite sure he did not wilfully violate any of the rules of the school.

23088. Suppose it was a very wet or cold day, I suppose the child himself would not be very grateful to the Board for a rule that would put him out into the cold?—It would, of course, be a great inconvenience.

23089. Is there a second man?—No.

23090. Then the only resource would be to put him out into the rain and storm?—Yes.

23091. The result, I think, of your general impression of the system is that you tolerate and make use of such schools under the National Board as are practically denominational?—That is, as a matter of fact, what I do. I am not saying or wishing it to be implied at all that I am satisfied at being obliged to act in that way.

23092. I quite understand that—I meant only that class of schools which is under the management of Roman Catholic clergymen and the teachers all of your own faith, and the property of the school-house such that you can consider it your own, if you are driven to it—but now I put the case of a Protestant landlord with a large Roman Catholic tenantry who builds a school for their benefit, and appoints Roman Catholic teachers, and only Roman Catholic teachers—would you sanction that school, he having the sole power to appoint the teacher with the approbation of the Board, and the power to dismiss the teacher?—As a general rule of course, I would say the clergymen ought not to encourage a school where the teacher would be appointed by a Protestant, even though that teacher should be a Roman Catholic—at the same time it is hard to give a general principle to govern all such cases, of course there might be exceptions, for instance if the Protestant gentleman of property who gives a site for a school be a gentleman of exceedingly kind and liberal opinions, and free from all suspicion of any proselyting intention, I should say circumstances of that kind would modify very much the action of the Roman Catholic clergymen. There is another circumstance, however, which would modify it much more, the possibility of his withdrawing his children at any future time when there would be any necessity from the school. For instance, in my locality the Catholic population is pretty numerous—we have a large per-

centage of local gentry well able to contribute. I might though theoretically and on principle I am so thoroughly opposed to the system—still I might be more inclined to tolerate a thing of that kind, than a person who would not have so clearly defined an opinion in opposition to the mixed system as myself, and for this reason, that if anything went wrong with the school I would find very little difficulty in building another. All these circumstances will influence every individual's case. A clergyman is often driven to submit, and, to tolerate for the time, what he really cannot help.

23093. The rule therefore would be rather to discourage such a school, but exceptional cases may arise to justify your supporting it. Suppose any of the teachers in such schools were Protestants, what difference would that make?—I can only speak for myself, I would at any cost try and teach the school myself, and devote my own house to it, sooner than allow the mixed system to become practically used in any school of mine—I would rather open the school and teach it in my own house myself, if I were driven to that extremity.

23094. You expressed a strong opinion in favour of denominational inspection, I think you said an Inspector of different faith might make mistakes or labour under misapprehension with regard to some of the observances of the school, and that difficulties might arise in that way—can you give me any instance of such misapprehension, or do you know any instance—because you are aware the National Board has adopted a system of non-denominational inspection, and that they have Protestant Inspectors of Roman Catholic schools, and Roman Catholic Inspectors of Protestant schools, are you aware of any fact that would support your condemnation of that system?—Well, I don't remember at this present moment, but it is a thing that is very possible, and may easily happen.

23095. I have asked almost all the teachers that have come here, both the teachers and the Inspectors examined before this Commission. I have asked them whether they have ever known any difficulty to arise from an Inspector of a different faith coming into a school—by a different faith, I mean different from that of the majority—and the answer I received was, as far as I remember, in the negative; that they never knew any difficulty to arise, therefore, as I know the clergy of your church have strong opinions on the subject, and insist that the Inspectors should be denominational, I am anxious to know the grounds of their opinion—I may say, in the first place, I do not think I have said anything that would justify so strong a word as "mistake."

23096. You are quite right, you have not, but some of your brethren have spoken very strongly about it; we had two bishops here who urged it very strongly; in fact, made it a *sero qua* non. In England the principle is acted upon—Really, I have not gone into the consideration of the question. There is, however, one very obvious thing may happen, especially in one school connected with religious establishments, it may and I know has happened, that an Inspector of another persuasion has sometimes shocked the feelings of the children and of the clergymen, who might be present, by not treating those ladies with the same respect that a Roman Catholic Inspector would have done. That is just an instance that occurs to my recollection at the moment. A Protestant Inspector cannot have the same appreciation of Roman Catholic practices. I am speaking now, of course, of a system in which Roman Catholic observances would be allowed to be carried out in the schools. I would have denominational schools and Roman Catholic influences brought to bear on the ordinary work of the education of the children, and, as a matter of course, these practices would come, more or less, under the observation of the Inspector. I can see nothing at all strange in supposing that a number of these practices might be misinterpreted by one not supposed to know their full purport and meaning. The case stands at present in a different position, because ordinarily speaking Catholic practices

Dec. 6, 1866  
Very Rev.  
Monseigneur  
Lauréat  
Rector, &c.  
&c.

Dec. 6, 1895.

Very Rev.  
Monaghan  
Lansdowne  
Forks, E.R.

are eliminated from the daily and ordinary teaching, and, therefore, when the Inspector comes to look at a school nothing of the kind occurs under his observation, and, therefore, the danger of misapprehending, under the present system, does not appear so striking; but I have known it to occur that a Protestant Inspector has not appreciated Catholic feelings and opinions as correctly as a Roman Catholic would have done.

23105. Does any other reason occur to you—any other objection to the employment of Protestant Inspectors?—Supposing the denominational system established, under which the Christian Brothers and Sisters of the Catholic Church would be engaged in the work of teaching, I cannot see how an Inspector of a different religious persuasion could avoid misapprehending and misconstruing a great number of things he would see. I cannot see how he could avoid it.

23106. His only object would be to inquire into the secular instruction—he would have no right to interfere or ask questions concerning the religious instruction—his inquiries would be purely confined to secular instruction?—I will give an illustration. Suppose while the Inspector was there the church bell rang twelve o'clock. The children would all rise and recite the Angelus—the three-fold annunciation of the mystery of the Incarnation, with a suitable prayer after it—which is a daily practice with every devout Catholic. The children would all rise or kneel down according to the day, to recite this prayer. A Protestant Inspector would be gazing about while this was going on—he would not know what was doing—he might probably be standing with his hat on.

23107. You must suppose at least that they are gentlemen, and not bores?—Well, I can assure you I speak of what has happened. In a Catholic school where a Protestant Inspector is present, and where a religious observance is suddenly brought into play, it would be almost impossible for him to avoid making some mistake. At the same time I am not aware that I said anything to justify the strong expression “intruding.”

23108. I think you said that if the rules of the Board were strictly carried out the nuns ought not to be permitted to enter a school?—I think so. I have always considered that a nun is a very strong “religious emblem.” There are no nuns except of the Catholic persuasion; they wear a certain habit, they carry their beads, their crucifix, and other things about them, which I take it a child would not be allowed to wear in the same school.

23109. You think the admission of convent schools to the participation in the benefits of the Board was a departure from the system?—I am not prepared to say that. I am only mentioning an instance which has often occurred to me and others, that the Board which was so stringent in removing a child, for instance, for making the sign of the cross, would be so inconsistent as to tolerate the presence of a nun in the school. It is one of those practical contradictions plainly arising from a system which with great respect I say, is at war with itself.

23110. I think you stated you obeyed the rules of the Board, stretching them as far as possible in favour of religious education?—Yes.

23111. Give me some instances of that stretching?—For instance, I would have prayers in the morning, on beginning the school.

23112. I am asking you as to actual practice?—I do not speak of the actual practice in the school at present, which may vary in details. I referred particularly to the school I was engaged in myself when I was in an inferior position in the Church—we used to begin our work in the morning with a prayer, reviewing our actions to Almighty God, and begging God's blessing and assistance during the day. We made it a rule also to have the “Angelus” recited—we arranged that by having religious instruction at twelve o'clock, and beginning with that prayer. Religious instruction then went on for the regular time, and then at the close of the school we generally concluded

with some hymn, a litany, or invocation of that kind, to wind up our work by reference to Almighty God. That was what we generally did. Well, of course, I did all these things as acting at the time for the patron of the school who could order the religious instruction. I am not saying that if an Inspector came in he might not according to his judgment have said, “This is too much of a good thing, and practically I don't see how you can expect that Protestants in the neighbourhood would come to this school.” An Inspector might take that view of it. In that sense I went as far as I possibly could in favour of denominational principles.

23113. Did you introduce in your reading classes any other books than those of the Board?—At the time I speak of I had no authority to do that, as I was merely representing another. We kept the most objectionable of the Board's books out of the school, and did not allow the children to use them, such as the “Evidences of Christianity,” and books of that kind. We kept them away from the children, but I had no authority in the selection of books at all at the time.

23114. Have you since done so—are there, in fact, any other books used?—I cannot say I have. In my parish the system has got into a traditional way of administration in which no practical difficulty is found. The masters know our views—the mistresses and the nuns know our views, and they have their own views on the relative merits of different portions of those books. I suppose they leave out some parts and dwell more on other portions of them, according as they are more or less in favour of our particular views on the subject of mixing up religious influences and instruction. I have, however, in the mistresses' classes, where the children are prepared by special instruction, outside the jurisdiction altogether of the Board, for the duty of monitors directed that the geography and history should be those of the Christian Brothers. I supplied these books myself to them in place of the Board's books.

23115. You have read the histories of the Christian Brothers?—I have read them, that is, I have looked into them, and, one way or another, I am acquainted with the greater portion of them. They are a religious body I have great confidence in, and I would read much more of the books I would suspect than of their books. I have not much time to read anything outside my business. I read a great deal more of other books than I do of the Christian Brothers' books, having great confidence in them, and because also I am satisfied from their being so much used, with the cognisance of the bishops and prelates through the country, that if there was anything objectionable in them it would be very soon observed and altered. I cannot say I have a complete knowledge of the contents of any books of the class we are speaking of. When I take up a book for the purpose of estimating its merits as a book of instruction for the young, whether geography or history, there are certain portions I turn to and see how they are treated. For instance, in a geography I turn to see how Spain and Italy are treated, and am sure either to find something unpleasant, very unfair and offensive to the feelings of Catholics, or, on the contrary, something very fair and impressive. The general tone of a book may always be tested by reference to a few passages in it. For the rest, we have such confidence in the teachers that we do not feel it necessary to have a very accurate knowledge of the books, if they come to us on good authority.

23116. What is that class of monitors you say are not under the control of the Board?—They are instructed by religious sisters who conduct the school at Blackrock; their residence is about a mile and a quarter from it, at another school and convent which are under my own particular care at present at Booterstown.

23117. That is at the Cross avenue?—Yes, near the Cross avenue. These sisters have, of course, a number of monitors, or young children of more promise than others, preparing to be monitors or instructors, or preparing to enter the training school at Baginbally, and afterwards to become mistresses of schools elsewhere, through the influence of the religious sisters. I found



Dec. 6, 1868  
Very Rev.  
Monaghan  
Leicester  
Fords, &c.,  
&c.

23129. If the managers were left free in the choice of books, would they not be likely to choose some books which, at all events, included some lessons of a distinctly Catholic character?—Are you speaking of the present system?

23130. I am speaking of the denominational system, which I understand you to advocate?—Oh, I should say as a matter of course that as far as a book on secular matters can have an exclusive character, I take for granted that these would be the books selected if they were within the compass or the means of the manager or patrons of the schools.

23131. If a school so conducted were inspected by Protestant Inspectors, would it not be necessary to give general instructions to such officers that they must not take notice of the substance of the lesson read, but must confine themselves to characterizing the reading?—Well, I should say that would be the only course open to them. They could scarcely extend their observation further at least than the surface. Other matters, as I stated, would be such as they would be very likely to misapprehend and misconstrue, and which they could scarcely be considered to be good judges of.

23132. I think you stated that you considered it as a very great safeguard that you kept in your hands the property of the schools?—Yes.

23133. You describe the schools as "your own"?—As our own. That is the strong point of our position.

23134. Will you tell me what you mean when you call the schools your own?—Do you contemplate converting them to other uses than education?—Oh, not in that sense of the word, but I would contemplate having always the power of disengaging myself from the supreme governing body of education, if I may use the expression, as a case of a collision that I could not see my way through, in a Catholic or religious sense.

23135. Do you not see the possibility of the State building alongside your school a far more pretentious building and carrying it on with a larger staff of teachers than you were able to supply in yours, how would the property, being in your hands, not be safeguarded?—Well, in the first place I am not arguing on the hypothesis that the State is going to educate the people at all. I do not consider it at all the function or the duty of the State to take in charge the education of the people. On the contrary, both on religious and political and social grounds, I would object most strongly to the State having anything to say to the education of the people more than contributing the funds and supplying the present emergency. Of course if the State took upon itself as a principle that it should educate the people, and that it was a principle that they should carry out at all costs, I could suppose the Government or the Board representing the Government, doing so foolish a thing as erecting an opposition school quite close to a very good school already in existence. But I take for granted that, ordinarily speaking, such a foolish thing would not be done. If it were done, of course we should only have to keep the children to ourselves—to use our influence and put before them the value of the religious education they get with us in comparison with the secular and indifferent one, so to speak, education they get elsewhere.

23136. Does not your safeguard really lie in the influence of the clergy on the parents rather than in the holding of the property of the schools?—Oh, yes; it directly lies very much in the influence of the clergy over the parents. But I need not say that it makes a very great difference whether the schools belong in their own right to the clergy as to persons having the confidence of the clergy, or to the State. If the State get possession of the schools, they would really have no reason for holding them except the claim to the function of educating the people, which I think is at variance both with religious and political freedom.

23137. As long as the clergy possess the influence, or anything approaching the influence, which they now enjoy in directing the children and their parents as to what schools are suitable for education, do you see any great danger in having the property vested either

in the Board or some other official person who would be a bare trustee holding the property for Catholic education, and with the obligation of keeping the premises in good repair?—Of course I should always see the strong objection that when a controversy or a difficulty would arise, in the solution it makes all the difference in the world whether the school is mine or the school belongs to the State. I would have the possession of the ground, and be the owner of the place, and the education of the children need not have to be suspended on account of the difference of opinion that arose between me on the one side and the representative of the State on the other; whereas, if it was the representative of the State who held the school, I should be put to the door then, as they say, and I should have to look after a new school, and in the meantime the State would have unavailing possession of the children.

23138. Are you satisfied that you could prove your title to the property in the schools?—My own title personally I am quite satisfied that I could not; but I am quite satisfied that those with whom I act, or whom I represent, could prove their title. They built the school, they were legal owners of the ground it is on, and the property is vested in trustees who hold it for purposes of religion, of which I am the recognised agent.

23139. The trustees, in your view, would have no power of alienating the property or converting it to any other use?—The way the matter happens is generally this—a certain portion of ground is taken for the purpose of building a Catholic church, a Catholic dwelling-house for the clergy, and a Catholic school, or it may be taken merely for the purpose, as it happens in the case of Blackrock, of building a Catholic church, but there happens to be ground enough remaining for building a school, and the parish priest erects a school on it, and he vests the property in trustees, sometimes with, and sometimes without any explicitly expressed definite object in the deed of trust, but merely for the perpetuation of the trust and handing down of the property. Generally speaking, our deeds are merely deeds for the purpose of holding and transmitting the property. The specific trust need not be mentioned in the deed, whether it is for the purpose of a school or what it is for. It is merely that the ground is vested in, say, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the parished clergyman for the time being, and some other clergymen, or perhaps laymen, for general religious purposes. The school is vested, the property is vested, but it is merely for the perpetuation of the trust, because the law does not recognise us as corporations sole.

23140. How many years' prescription have you in Ireland?—Really, that is a subject that I have those vague ideas about that people that are conversant with worldly matters will have, but I could not speak with any accuracy on the subject.

23141. It is not accurate, in it, to speak of the property of the schools as your own?—Well, I do not speak of it in the same way that I would call my house my own. It is not my own in the sense that I can dispose of it; but it is mine in the sense that so long as I am agent or representative of the Church and of religion that I am master there. I am, as the French say, "elles sont."

23142. Is it not held in trust one way or other for education?—Well, I cannot say if you went into a court of equity in what way a lawyer would complicate matters for us, and would make it apparent, for instance, that I should have no right to alienate the property of the school to another religious purpose, and for this very reason it is not desirable that our trust deeds should be too specific in the expression of the purposes of the trust. Under the Board, there are three several distinct ways of holding these schools. There is, first, the vested school under them directly. There is, secondly, the school vested in trustees for the purposes of the National Board. Now, in none of these cases would the clergyman have the influence he has when the school is simply vested in the Most Rev. Paul Cullen and the Very Rev. Law-

notes Forde, and some other person, they taking care, as soon as one of these parties died, to renew the trust and convey it on to three trustees still, merely for the purpose of holding down the property for religious, or even general educational purposes.

23143. Do you think that in a non-vested school, held in the way that you describe, the priest has more power than he has in a vested school within the trusts expressed in the deed of the vested school?—There is this difference at least, that in the latter case, even when the school is not vested in the Board, but in trustees, for the purposes of National education, the priest is not free to adopt any other system. In the case of a school held as I describe, we could not, of course, run the property exclusively as our own; and I never intended that we should call it ours in that sense; but, practically, we have the real influence when the school is built by the Catholic clergyman, that the school belongs to him, or rather the trustees held it for him, and the Roman Catholic clergyman, for the time being, and thus he will always be, as usual, at least in his school as he would be in his church. That is the way I feel about the matter, at least, and I believe there is a good deal of substantial ground for the feeling also.

23144. Would you call the church his own?—I would not. In the most Catholic system I would not call the church his own. I mean to say, that in a country where the Catholic Church is acknowledged as a corporation, I would not say the church belonged to the Catholic priest.

23145. Does not the church belong to the parish?—I would never use it, as the Catholic priest for the time being, as the manager of a public institution. I could not say that everything used for church or religious purposes belongs to the priest for the time being, for we know it does not, of course it does not, for he could not convert it to other uses, he could not make a dwelling-house of the church. Even legally, I suppose any parishioner could file a petition in the Court of Chancery, and oblige us, by law, to keep our churches always applied to the purposes for which they were originally built. In that sense they do not certainly belong to the Catholic priest, for the time being, but they belong to the Catholic Church as a body, assembling or standing, as far as it can, by means of legal machinery, the functions of a corporate body, which it is not recognised to be in this country, and as such, in that way they would exercise a much more conclusive influence over the disposal of the schools than they would if the schools were either vested in trustees, for the purposes of the Board, or vested in the Board itself.

23146. Suppose the schools to be vested by a deed which set out the trusts in a way which would be quite approved by the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities, would you say that such schools were not as well held as the schools held under the indefinite trusts which you describe?—Well, I really do not know. That is a legal question; and very naturally in a country where we found so many centuries the law the representative of a power antagonistic to us, we gave it "as wide a berth," to use a seaman's phrase, as we could. I suppose there was a certain policy in doing so. But if everything was conducted *bona fide*, and in a religious sense, I should say that a deed such as you describe—and I suppose there are a good many deeds in which property is conveyed for the purpose of building a school for the religious infants and purposes of the Catholic community—would be a very safe form of deed to execute, provided the ecclesiastical authorities were allowed to decide as doubtful or disputed cases what should be considered religious purposes or otherwise. The tribunal to which such questions should be referred would make all the difference in the world.

23147. Would it not be even safer than the latter mode of holding?—Well, I think the latter mode of holding would be always amenable to a petition to the Court of Chancery, I take it, under any circumstances; so that even the law way of holding it would be safe, for instance, if it happened that I was the sole surviving trustee of the property of my church and my

school, as I might call them, and supposing I died without a re-conveyance of the trust, the property might in the first instance fall into the hands of my natural heirs; but they would be always liable to a suit in equity, and would unquestionably be obliged to give the schools back to the purposes for which they were originally intended.

23148. You stated, I think, that you were not prepared to go into the general question of the management of model schools which have been condemned by the bishops?—I have; I could not go into the question of the detailed personal management of any of them. I have only hearsay information as to their working. With regard to their statistics I know very little. At the same time I know the general principles on which they are founded, and the general grounds of objection to them.

23149. Since these distinct model schools, as is notorious, have been condemned by the combined action of the Catholic bishops, do you consider the appointment of teachers to these schools to be a benefit or a wrong to the persons appointed, supporting them to be Catholics?—Well, each person is the best judge for himself of what is a benefit to him, or what is not. Religiously speaking, I think it certainly places the Catholic who is appointed to the school in a very false position. In that sense it is certainly an injury to him. As far as the influence of those who direct the religious matters of the country is a matter for his consideration, it may be a material injury to him also, just as it is now a material injury to a young man to be trained in a model school, he cannot get employment as a Roman Catholic school managed by a Roman Catholic priest, if he have been trained after a certain period—I believe since the year 1852—I do not know the exact date. That is an injury to him certainly, not only in a spiritual but in a temporal point of view.

23150. Taking a model school where the teachers as well as the children are excluded from the sacraments by the authorities of the Church, would you say that the Board can answer the objections of the bishops by putting in Catholic teachers to serve in that school, would that be making the matter better or would it be making it worse?—It would certainly not mend matters on the general aspect of the question. In an individual case it would be hard to determine whether the bad Catholic or the Protestant would make the worst teacher for Catholic children. It would be a choice between alternatives, both so bad that neither could be accepted. Considering the grove and fundamental objections there are to the model schools, I do not think that anything that could be done with them except making them denominational, would at all satisfy the scruples of the Catholic body on the subject.

23151. Does it not strike you as a cruel wrong, especially, towards individuals, for the Board to continue to appoint young Catholics to positions where they cannot follow the dictates of their religion?—Well, it is a hard-hearted thing if you like to say it, but boards are not supposed to have hearts at all. It is an unpleasant thing, and it certainly places them in a very false position, and injures their temporal prospects, also, so far as they expect to realise them by teaching in schools under Catholic management or Catholic guidance.

23152. Have you any complaints to make with regard to the manner in which the Board has treated Dublin National schools under Catholic management?—You speak of the ordinary schools?

23153. Yes?—Nothing strikes me as to the way the matter of general education is treated. Their relations with the Board, as far as I know of them, are as nearly as possible limited to purely financial matters, and the question would, therefore, mean whether they give them a sufficient allowance from the public funds or not, and in that point of view I certainly think that they treat the schools in connexion with religious bodies unfairly. They get better teaching, generally speaking, better results as regards the children, and there is a

Dec. 6, 1866.

Very Res.  
Management  
Lawrence  
Hobbs, &c.,  
&c.

Dec. 6, 1865  
Very Rev.  
Messrs.  
Lawrence  
Furze, &c.  
&c.

larger teaching force, of a superior quality engaged in producing those results, yet certainly the payment or compensation is not in the same proportion, or anything like the same proportion, that is awarded to secular teachers. It is, however, not easy to answer the question in general terms, or by reference merely to the fixed scales of remuneration, because very often the Board do very liberal things, whatever their object may be in it; they are sometimes very liberal in the disposal of their money; they have plenty of it, I believe, to dispose of, and they do a great deal for us sometimes in that way, but it is generally by something which you may call a side-wind, that they manage to do it. For instance, they will not give us assistant teachers in the normal schools, but they give us a number of pupil teachers and monitors, with more or less salary, but these are more seasonal things according to the policy of the moment. They sometimes deal more liberally, and sometimes they are harder to be managed. Very often it appears one influence is in the ascendant, and at other times another influence is in the ascendant, and the action of the Board is very much according to the predominating influence of the hour.

23154. Do you recollect that at one time the Board professed an intention to pay particular attention to the schools in Dublin, so as to make the buildings really good, and provide them with increased facilities for education?—I do not remember.

23155. Do you agree in the opinion which has been expressed before us that the school buildings in Dublin are amongst the most wretched in the kingdom?—I am not very familiar with the buildings themselves; we have some very fine schools, and others perhaps not so. The fact is, you know, we generally do the best we can to get the school on foot, and the first step we take, if we have not a building sufficient, is to hire one, and we place the school, if possible, in connection with the Board, and get on as well as we can, until we are able to build a better school. Except the schools of the Sisters of Mercy, the schools of the Sisters of Charity, and the Christian Brothers' schools, I am not very conversant with the appearance or even the location of the schools generally of the city of Dublin.

23156. Do you think there is any reason to believe that the ordinary National schools have been allowed to fall into their wretched condition in order that the children, especially the Catholic children, may be driven to attend the schools in Marlborough-street?—Well, I should be sorry to impute a motive. My attention was never drawn before to the subject in itself, or in connection with a motive. My attention never was drawn to the condition of the ordinary schools of the city in that point of view, and still less was it drawn to it in connection with the motive suggested as which you indicate. You must observe, too, that we do claim to be the owners, in the sense explained, of the schools, and as we refuse and from the Board in making them better than they are architecturally, except on terms which the Board has declined not to admit, it would be scarcely fair to hold the Board accountable, or to attribute to any feeling on their part, the inferior architectural character of our schools.

23157. As Vice-General, have you no special acquaintance with school buildings in the city of Dublin?—No, as Vice-General my business would be to interfere in purely exceptional cases that might be brought before me, either for the purpose of advice or for the purpose of redress, if anything was going wrong.

23158. Have you ever been led to compare or contrast the National schools of Dublin with those of Belfast?—I have never been in Belfast but once or twice for very short visits.

23159. You could do it by reference to the reports, to see the number of the schools and the aid they got. Are you aware whether, under the system as administered by the Board, it is more profitable to set up a number of small schools than a few large

schools, because the payment of the teachers is drawn wholly from the public funds, and a greater number of teachers would be employed in numerous small schools than in a few large schools in the same neighbourhood?—Well, as I have said, I have formed my own opinion of the whole system very early, and that may be probably one of the reasons why I do not attend very much to the various causes of complaint or observation that arise from time to time. I believe I heard the observation you are after making—that the North, and Belfast in particular, was more liberally dealt with than other parts of the country.

23160. With regard to the attendance at Marlborough-street or any other model school, is it not a principle of morals generally that of two evils it is lawful to choose the less, and may not attendance at a model school, even under the management of the Board, be a less evil than complete ignorance?—It depends on the quality of the evils. Certainly— I said in reply to a former question—there are cases where there is a predominant and overwhelming evil that should overrule every other consideration, and every case of individuals must stand on its own merits. With regard to the evils in the case you mention, on the one hand you have a certain amount of ignorance, and on the other hand you have real religious rules to be encountered. Well, some will say that it is better to submit to that amount of ignorance or combat it with more imperfect means, than encounter a religious rule which they deem extreme. On the other hand, if you can suppose the population or children of a country in general to be so totally inaccessible, through ignorance, to religious influences, as that the number of religious could make no head at all of them on account of their ignorance, there might be a case for being more tolerant in admitting a system where a certain amount of risk would have to be encountered, and guarded against, and I am satisfied, that whether right or wrong in their application of this view, that they were considerations of this kind, and not any approval of the system as *such*, that induced any Catholic prelate, who, in the earlier discussions on this subject, appeared in favour of the National system to support it. It is this same principle that rules in morality the decision of all cases where there is a certain amount of moral risk incurred, so in certain occupations, lawful in themselves, but then containing well-known elements of moral danger, in consequence of their liability to be abused through personal frailty. For instance, in the case of a young man going to the surgical profession, or the navy, or anything of that kind, all of which, of course, more or less involve risk to morals, and a parent, when selecting a profession for his son, has to decide whether it is a wise or proper thing to send him to such and such a profession. Well, then is the consideration of the necessity of his devoting himself to this or that profession on the one hand, and of the dangers on the other hand. These considerations enter into all questions of the kind, and the cases are generally ruled accordingly by the prudence of the individual and his advisers. I do not know whether I explain myself?

23161. Quite!—It is what Catholic divines call the doctrine of the rule they apply to the toleration of what may be looked upon as material sins or dangers of sin. For instance, everybody knows that there are professions that are more dangerous for persons to enter into than others, there are trades even that are very dangerous; for instance, the trade in opium, drink and things of that kind are very dangerous. Persons contract very bad habits in them, and still you cannot always, on account of these dangers, say—“You are obliged under pain of incurring the anger of Almighty God, to abstain from that trade, when it is the very means of supporting yourself.” You must try and maintain, and reduce these dangers to their minimum by religious exercises and other influences, that is the way in which we deal with cases of the kind, and I suppose the same principle can be applied even to going to a model school in an individual case, although I apprehend—namely, as there can be no very urgent



Dec. 8, 1866  
Very Rev  
Monseigneur  
Louis-Philippe  
Forsyth, P.S.  
&c.

necessity for seeking in a model school what can be as well had elsewhere—that the urgency of such a case will generally arise from the unfair pressure of external influence. However, in any case that I should hear of, until I should have well examined the circumstances, I would not judge at once and condemn a person harshly because I heard that he happened to be in a model school, or even in a much worse place. I should have to know his motives and reasons, and the emergency which led him into it, and a variety of other matters which would rule the decision of the individual question.

23162 Does it not follow from what you have stated that the attendance of Catholic children at the model schools, be they few or many, does not stamp the model schools with any particular approval, but only indicates that the attendance involves less evil than the staying away?—It does; but I do not think, as a practical fact, that the attendance at the model schools has any sanction at all, as there is really no general necessity for attending them for purposes of ordinary instruction.

23163 If the interference of the Crown or the Government in *parvois* is to be invoked, would you not say its power should be applied to making available, in the first instance, the great endowments existing in this country for education, so as to include the majority of Catholics in their benefits who are now excluded from all participation in them?—Well, I would rather discuss the question, leaving out altogether the element of the position that is assigned to the Crown or the Government, because I am, from habit of thought and early training inclined to restrict Government or State interference in ordinary affairs to the lowest possible degree; I would then move either *de jure* or *de facto* of the question irrespective of that element. I think it is the duty of any person—and therefore perhaps even more than any other person of the State, as commanding more means—in authority or possessing the power to do so, to redress an urgent evil that is pressing either on an individual or on the community, and therefore, just as in times of famine, or in times of pestilence, I would call on individuals and corporate bodies, and above all, on the State for exceptional exertions; so I would call on the State in this country for exceptional and great exertions in the way of extending and diffusing good education, considering the real necessity that exists for it, and the great disability that prevails throughout a large majority of the population of this country, to provide themselves with it, and in particular when we consider the various historic causes that led to that condition of things, I think the duty, so to speak, of the State to provide for the emergency is greater than even it would be under ordinary circumstances. I use the word “duty,” because I distinctly decline to say anything in favour of abdicating the right of the State to educate. I think it may have a duty but not a right or specific function for that purpose. Therefore, of course, if you allow me to continue, I consider that anything the State might do to render useful endowments that are already existing, and over which it possesses legitimate control, or contributing to the diffusion of free and religious education would be an undoubted benefit, and more than in any other country, a duty, I think, on the part of the State in this country.

23164 In the denominational system which you approve, would it be necessary or desirable to establish separate training schools for masters and mistresses?—That is, denominational training schools?

23165 Yes!—Oh, certainly.

23166 Have you thought on this system of training in such denominational training schools?—Really, not in detail. My business never lay in that direction, and therefore I never viewed the subject of the details of the training in itself. My business never habitually lay in the direction of marking out educational courses, especially of a secular kind, in any way.

23167 Can you say whether the State should provide premises to be used as training schools for Catholic masters and Catholic schoolmistresses?—Of course,

holding to my own views on the subject of the great advantage and independence it gives us to be the owners of the institutions themselves, I prefer that we should find the premises ourselves, if it were possible. We always have to meet great difficulty in this country from poverty and want of means.

23168 Who would be the managers of such institutions?—If I were establishing training schools I would take the elements we have at hand; I would give the training schools, those that I should have the control of, in preference to any other bodies to the Christian Brothers, and to the religious communities of nuns. At the same time if a system were devised which would involve the appointment of secular trainers, and secular instructors, of course, I would not absolutely refuse it. I must add, that a great deal would depend on whether those secular training schools were the exclusive training schools of the country or not; because I think that the existence of a number of well managed religious training schools would always tend to exercise a controlling and corrective influence even over the secular ones; and therefore I should have less objection to the establishment of secular training schools where they would be co-existent with others of a religious character than if there were no others but themselves.

23169 Would you leave the management of the denominational training school to the priest in whose parish it happened to be built?—Well, I never thought on the question—of course the parochial clergymen would have a good deal of inspection and influence in religious matters in it; but I certainly would not advocate as a necessary part of any system that I should devise that he should be a secular instructor or that he should ever, except where he could produce just reason, have a predominant influence in arranging secular instruction. It is quite possible that even clergymen that are remarkably well informed on clerical and other matters, would make a very bad hand at devising the purely secular education of a training school. I would very much rather leave it in the hands of persons that I should have full confidence in, than take it into my own.

23170 Is there not a wide difference between an ordinary parochial school established as a place for the instruction of his parishioners and a training school extending to a large circle of schools, embracing perhaps a diocese or a province?—Of course in the working of it and in the requirements of studies there is a great difference.

23171 Must there not be a somewhat different management devised?—Well, I should say so. I do not exactly understand the drift of the question.

23172 Are you not exclusive manager of the parochial schools in your parish?—Yes, in religious matters, or such as are connected with religion. In the official sense of the word I am not at present “manager” of any of them.

23173 Supposing a denominational training school to be established in your parish, would you say that you should be manager of that also in the same way that you manage your own schools?—Well, I consider it possible that my neighbours might object to my having the management of a school that had such an influence over their schools as well as over my own.

23174 Have you considered any scheme of management?—Well, not in any detail, but it is a matter which on our part would present no difficulty which might not be arranged in a quarter of an hour’s reflection. Of course it quite obviously strikes me at once the general principle of the arrangement would be that the religious management should vest in the bishop of the diocese.

23175 Such a training school would no doubt fall under the special jurisdiction of the bishop as one of the charitable institutions of the diocese, would it not?—Well, putting it in the point of view that you put it in now, a great deal would depend on the terms of the foundation of the institution itself, to what extent the bishop would control it. The bishop, according to our law, has a general respective right nearly over

Dec. 8, 1880

Very Rev.  
Montagu  
Lowe  
F.R.S., &c.

every charity, to see that the trusts are fulfilled; and it would be his duty to call parties to account for not fulfilling the trust, and in that sense it would certainly fall under his jurisdiction if it were an ordinary charitable foundation. Of course if it were a foundation of the State, I suppose the State would take care of itself and would give the bishop very little control over the material or financial details.

23176 And in it you expect that the State will found denominational training schools?—It would be my wish that the State should contribute to the foundation of training schools in sufficient number for the wants of the country.

23177 If the State contributed funds towards the erection of training schools, do you not think that it would certainly require that all such schools should be placed on trust in a defined way for the special purpose for which the public money was contributed to?—I suppose if the State were making a permanent foundation for all future time to come, the State would take care that it should have sufficient control to mind the funds and see that they were properly applied. But I must say that I am shown completely outside my line when once you introduce the element of the State into the question at all. I think the State should limit its work as much as possible to the contribution of money, and to seeing that that money was properly spent. This would be obviously all that would be needed in cases where the State did not supply the buildings, but merely contributed on a certain system to the support of them as training institutions.

23178 Do you remember what is known as the Footscatham letter?—Yes—on the training schools—I think I do.

23179 It appears to have been contemplated by Mr. Chichester Fortescue in that letter—that the different religious bodies should take upon themselves the duty of providing premises in which the young persons would be trained?—I have no doubt that they would do it as far as the work would be intrusted to them.

23180 Would that be done by a general collection throughout the diocese, do you think?—Well, as a matter of fact, I do not think there would be much need of that. The religious bodies would work for themselves, and upon their own buildings. For instance, the Sisters of Mercy would very probably devote a portion of their premises at once to the purposes of a training school, if they got a sufficient assistance from the State to support the pupils. There would be no question of a collection in the diocese at all in such cases. There would be a question merely of the voluntary act of the religious association devoting itself to the work of education as a work of charity, and giving up a portion of the premises already built for the purpose of schools, and devoting them now exclusively to the purposes of training schools. Even when some additional expense should be incurred, the religious bodies would probably prefer undertaking themselves to accept money of meeting it from the diocese, which would thus so far acquire some property claim on the institution. That is one form in which the project would be worked out. Again, the Christian Brothers have very large schools under their charge, or belonging to them. For instance, there are very large schools and a residence in Westland-row. These buildings are purely parochial. They have been built by the parish. Very possibly these buildings would be converted into training schools; these would be the other side of the question. There the parish owns the schools, and uses the Christian Brothers as instructors. In that case the Christian Brothers would not be giving up a part of their premises, and the parish or diocesan authorities would, I dare say, be at the cost, if necessary, of enlarging and increasing the present premises in Westland-row, and thereby making them fit to be used for the purpose of a training school. Lastly, the Christian Brothers have large premises, with which I suppose you are acquainted, in their possession in the neighbourhood of Richmond street. If they gave them up for the purpose of training schools, it would be the first case

again—that of a religious body giving up a portion of its premises for that purpose.

23181 In the case of a denominational training school started in the way you suggest by a religious body, what extent of annual support should you expect the State to contribute towards the maintenance of the establishment?—That would altogether depend on the circumstances, but I do hope that the time will come when the Irish Catholic public will not be so dependent on the State for support as they are at present, because I have a jealousy of State interference in the matter at all if it could be avoided. I hope the time will come when we shall not be so dependent as at present. We should require a very considerable sum just now, sufficient at least to support the pupils, and to supply the requisites of the school. We should do it, however, at a much cheaper cost than the model schools do it at present.

23182 Would you expect the public purse to contribute the whole or only a portion of the cost of the maintenance?—Well, really I cannot say that I have considered the question in that way. As I said I should be glad if we could do without the State altogether, and I should expect them to contribute nothing at all if we did not want it. At present I should expect them to contribute all we wanted for rendering the schools efficient, and merely that because they would be supplying the necessities of the country, which I think they are under a special obligation bound to supply.

23183 If the State supplied the whole cost of maintaining institutions managed by nuns at their sole discretion, do you not think it likely that in the course of time public opinion across the water would be excited against such institutions in a way which would render their existence precarious?—Well, I do not know. Public opinion is a very variable quantity, and it sometimes takes a very sudden impulse in one direction, and sometimes in another. I believe at present the tide is setting rather in our favour. I do not know how long it may continue so.

23184 You think that the public opinion of the English people is in favour of Catholic institutions?—I think they are in favour of doing what is just and fair. Indeed I will say more—I think they are in favour of redressing the grievances under which the population of this country have laboured for a long time, and of doing what is fair and just.

23185 Is it not proposed to redress grievances by polling down rather than by building up?—Well, one special grievance they are applying, I think, that remedy to.

23186 Do you think that the House of Commons would continue to vote the funds necessary for a training school under the Christian Brothers?—Really, Mr. Stokes, you are examining me in a line in which I am very incompetent to answer. I can form a very poor opinion of what the House of Commons may do. It would, however, be in the interest of the general public to meet the necessity of training institutions in the cheapest and most efficient way possible.

23187 Do you not think it wiser, from your own point of view, as well as upon general principles which influence others, that the Catholic body, if they succeed in obtaining from the Government denominational training schools, should annually contribute a portion of the expenses out of their own funds towards the maintenance of such institutions?—Well, I think that that would be a fair view for the British public to take of it. But, at the same time, if it can be shown the public that the Catholic body could not do it, and that it was in a great degree the fault of the public that the Catholic body were not able to do it, I think it would be a balancing consideration. At the same time, I am not prepared to say what effect it would have on the House of Commons or the public mind of England. I am only saying what I think fair and just myself.

23188 Do you not think it desirable that this education question should now be settled in such a form as is likely to be permanent, so as to leave open no irritating questions on points likely to arise from your

to year in voting the annual sums required for Irish education?—It would be satisfactory if it were. At the same time few arrangements are permanent nowadays. With regard to the question of funds, which we are dealing with at this moment, I have already stated that I should be very glad to see the day when we should be perfectly independent of the State, if possible, meanwhile, however, till that day should come, every year I should be very well satisfied to have a change in the estimates and the sum allocated, if it should appear that we were able to contribute more than previously in proportion to the allowance of the State. I look upon State interference as a matter of necessity only, and that it is the duty of the State, as long as it is necessary, to supply what is required for the education of the people, up to a certain point at least.

23189. Do you think the Catholic body would be satisfied if no contribution at all from the public purse were made towards the training of nuns and missionaries?—Well, as a rule, no person likes to pay if he can get another to pay for him, and so far the general public would naturally prefer the State should pay to pay itself by themselves, but, I think, at the same time, that thoughtful men viewing the real merits of the question would probably incline as much as I do myself to the opinion, that education conducted irrespective of State interference, and therefore irrespective of State funds, is preferable to education with State intervention and State funds. I may observe that I do not think it is likely to be a very practical question in our day, because certainly I am afraid that we shall be very dependent for many years to come on the public purse.

23190. Have you ever given any attention to the view which the law takes of the mixture of religion in education, especially in endowed schools—your attention has never been called to it?—No.

23191. I want you, if you please, to be so good as to listen to a decision given in the Court of Chancery by one of the Vice-Chancellors, and to say whether your opinion agrees with it. It was a case in which endowments not expressly given for education were to be applied for school purposes. It was proposed that the school should be open to the children of parents of all religious denominations. Instruction in Scripture was provided daily, the school being closed on Sunday, and no mention was made of the religious creed of the master and mistress. Vice-Chancellor Knight Bruce laid down in decided terms that—

"It might be a question whether or not any part of the fund ought to be devoted to the purposes of education at all, but that if any part were so applied religion must be considered, for that any scheme of education without religion would be worse than a mockery. In my judgment this scheme does not provide for what I am able to consider religious instruction at all. If education, of course including religious instruction, is to be provided for, I apprehend it must be according to doctrine and principles of the English Church. I do not think it necessary to declare that either the masters or teachers should be clergymen, but that the master, mistress, and teachers should all be members of the Church of England, and that no other course of religious instruction should be adopted than such as is in conformity with the Church of England."

It was afterwards agreed that the masters and mistresses should be members of the Church of England, and that on every Lord's Day the master should give instruction in the liturgy, catechism, and articles of the Church of England to each of the boys whose parents were in communion with that Church; all the scholars to go twice every Lord's Day to church, but the children of those who were not in communion might be excused by any two trustees giving a written note. Does that view of the Vice-Chancellor that religion is an essential part of all education, agree with the sentiments which you hold on the subject?—Oh, certainly, I think I have indicated that sufficiently by the tenor of my answers.

23192. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—And these other parties not approving of that religious education should be excused?—I am not aware that there was anything

in the passage read by Mr. Stokes with regard to other parties being excused.

23193. Mr. Stokes.—You do not approve of obliging any children who are not Catholics to attend Mass on Sunday?—Oh, certainly not.

23194. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you approve of a system giving liberty to parties to be excused whose parents did not wish them to join in religious instruction?—I think Mr. Stokes asked me specifically whether I agreed with the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor that religion should be the basis of education, and I said that I did.

23195. Mr. Stokes.—I read this—"All the scholars to go twice every Lord's Day to church, but the children of those who were not in communion might be excused?"—Of course they should be excused.

23196. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you apply that to the matter of religious instruction?—I do not like dealing with mixed communities at all where religion is concerned. I would rather have every religious denomination pursuing its own religion perfectly untrammelled by mixture with any other.

23197. Having approved of that principle as to the attendance at church at religious worship, should you apply the same principle in the matter of religious instruction in schools?—I have already objected to having Catholics and Protestants mixed up in the same school for the purpose of education. If there be unfortunately a school where there are Protestants and Catholics mixed that way, I think the question might be put in a less vague way and with the same practical results. I think I could answer it if it were put in a less vague way.

23198. Having indicated that principle, so far as attendance at religious worship is concerned—will you indicate the same principle with regard to religious instruction in the case of scholars, either Protestant or Catholic, attending schools?—I have not indicated an opinion at all, or answered at all with reference to that portion of the extract which had reference to the attendance at religious worship. I simply answered, in reply to Mr. Stokes, that I thoroughly approved of the judgment of the Vice-Chancellor of England, that religion should be the basis of all education, my answer had no reference whatever to the portion of the extract which referred to the provision that children should not be compelled to go to Church service on Sundays if their parents objected.

23199. Now, what do you say on that point?—I certainly would not approve of forcing any child to attend religious service contrary to the wishes of his parent.

23200. Well, would you give the child liberty to withdraw?—If the diffy of your question is to find out my opinion on the relative merits of the different methods that have been devised from time to time by the Board for securing the non-enforcement of religious instruction on children of different persuasions, I can give my opinion clearly on that.

23201. I am simply speaking of the point brought out in that decision?—Is it the machinery that you wish to have my opinion on?

23202. I repeat a question I put to you a moment ago. Having indicated that principle, so far as religious worship is concerned, will you indicate the same principle in the matter of religious instruction in the case of scholars, either Protestant or Catholic, attending schools?—I answer that the question refers to the substance itself, or it refers to the machinery adopted for the attaining of the effect. If you ask me do I indicate the opinion that children ought not to receive religious instruction contrary to the wishes of their parents, I say, certainly not, they ought not. If you ask me whether the mere matter of parents signifying their consent or dissent in a certain form is the best way of preventing proselytism, I suggested that the question might be proposed less vaguely, and with more definite reference to what appeared to me to be the object of the question, namely, to give my appreciation of the relative merits of the different means that have been adopted at different times by the Board, and by those who have had relations with the Board, to prevent re-

Dec. 6, 1898  
 Very Rev.  
 Messrs. Com.  
 Education, &c.,  
 &c.

Religious instruction being given to children of different persuasions, because you are aware that the Board has altered its mode of acting with regard to that in various ways. In the beginning it was to give combined secular and separate religious instruction, no child being allowed to be present at religious instruction, other than that of the child's own faith, so that even the suspicion of jealousy might be removed. After some time an agitation was set on foot, which resulted in the adoption of what was called the Stepford rule or clause, and then, I believe, the practice adopted by the Board was to oblige the parents to object to the religious instruction which their children received, otherwise the teacher or other religious instructor was at liberty to allow the children of a different persuasion to remain present during the instruction. Latterly the rule is that parents must signify, in writing, their assent to the religious instruction the children get, so that, of course, if you ask me my impression of the various modes of preventing jealousy, I do say that the last is the only efficient and efficacious means of doing it.

23203. Mr. Sullivan.—In Prussia, where the system is strictly denominational, the parish school is governed by a small board or committee, of which the parish priest, in the case of the Catholic schools, is the ex officio president. There are four other members, and they form the committee who regulate the school. Have you ever thought of the advisability of having schools in Ireland placed under similar conditions? Never very particularly. I never turned my attention very profoundly to the consideration of it, every question of this kind is involved in so many practical considerations that you would have really to devote a considerable time to taking them all into account before promulgating your opinion as to how the system would work. For instance, a person would have to ask in that case would you get a local board who would act with the Catholic clergyman in the matter. Many people would say that the laity in the neighborhood are perfectly well satisfied when they contribute their offering for the support of the parochial schools, and that you could scarcely get that board to assemble. That is a consideration of altogether a practical nature and bearing; and many other considerations of the same kind would have to be taken into account before you could decide whether this or that system would prove of as a practical utility to the country. How it works in Prussia I do not know. As a rule, indeed, boards, I believe, generally do not work well in this country, and I am afraid that the parish priest would be left very much to himself.

23204. In that case he would not be worse off than he is at present—would he? He could not alone?—Well, I suppose so far as leaving him independent, it would be more apparently satisfactory to him and more in accordance with the principles of our Church in these matters, but so far as the practical result of the determinations come to from day to day, it is quite possible that he might even be better advised for having a small laymen in his own parish to point out considerations and suggest views that possibly might never come into his head if he were left in the perfectly unassisted control of the school.

23205. But, as a general rule, would not the existence of three or four persons interested in the school be likely to conduce to the better working of the school than where there is only one who has a great many other things to attend to, even if they only gave an occasional half hour to it?—As a general rule, I think that the parish clergyman has much more time to attend to the school than many persons you could name who would be members of a board, except a paid board, when only it would be to assist him. I am perfectly sure that the board would share the fate of all other such boards—it would fall into the hands of the parish priest and perhaps one person who would have a hobby or taste for looking after the matter, but as a rule, a board, I think, in this country would not be productive of any good effect.

23206. Why should it be effective in Prussia, and not here?—Oh, really, I do not know. I never lived in Prussia, and I do not know much about their institutions.

23207. You were asked did you think that the Roman Catholic laity held opinions different from those of the bishops and clergy?—Now, what do the Roman Catholic laity themselves do when they are sending their children to school?—They always send their children to Roman Catholic schools.

23208. Are the exceptions where they do not vary numerous in this country?—Certainly not. I know some very strong advocates in theory converse and suggest reasons—in a friendly way, of course, not in a controversial or polemic way—in favour of the mixed system at present subsisting; yet at the same time, when it comes to a question of practice, they send their children to Catholic schools always.

23209. As a matter of fact, have not the advocates of the mixed system since repudiated the same principle as applied to the intermediate schools to which they might send their own children?—Well, I really can scarcely say that they have repudiated it, because they have very little opportunity of sending their children to schools that do not exist. I speak of the upper classes of society and the middle classes who would have a choice of schools. They never think of sending a boy or a girl to any school but one of their own denomination, and if possible they have them taught by religious and nuns.

23210. Has your attention been called to a meeting on the question of intermediate education in Cork, where the principle was repudiated by the advocates of the mixed system in primary schools?—Yes; I believe there was a meeting there some years ago, at which I think the Rev. Dr. Croker spoke; and I believe that the feeling of that meeting which was got up, and convened at a time when there was a question of getting up a Government system of intermediate education, was altogether in favour of the view that the Catholic bishops and priests took of the question. They were altogether in favour of denominational education, and against the introduction of the mixed system.

23211. With respect to the parents being satisfied with the ordinary schools at present under the National system, does that satisfaction arise rather from the fact that they are in their own hands practically, than from the principles of the system itself?—It certainly did arise from their having, first, no choice but to deal with the state of facts that they have before them—that they could do nothing else than deal with the Board, and secondly, that they are really the owners of the schools, and being masters there, they can neutralize the evils which they all recognize in the mixed system. Certainly their satisfaction does not result from any acquiescence in or approval of the mixed system.

23212. Does not the same argument apply to the case of the bishops and clergy who have availed of the system, but not approved of it—must not a distinction be drawn between availing of the system, and approving of it?—Yes, I have always, from the very commencement of the examination, held that view upon the matter, that the bishops and priests who have appeared to tolerate the mixed system in this country, tolerate it because practically it was not raised, and they found it to be a denominational system.

23213. Then when the bishops, and the Catholic laity as well as the bishops, in any particular district, are taking the whole country into account, adopt that system, and appear to tolerate as it were and cling to it, is that a proof that they have adopted that system upon principle, or rather, is it not that they think it the best system under the circumstances that they can get?—I am sure they merely tolerate it as the best system they have been able to get under the circumstances. They hope for what they believe to be a better system, and if they did not consider it to be such they would not try for it, because few people try for what they believe to be unfavourable; and it is decidedly

the case, that they merely tolerate the system as the only thing they have been able to get, and their toleration of it does not by any means imply their approval of it.

23214 Do you think it wise of the Government to attempt to carry out a system which is not adopted justly by the great majority of the people?—Well, it is contrary to a primary principle of legislation that law ought to be accommodated to the manners and prejudices of the people. There is no other legislation or system that will get on except one that is in harmony with the general feeling of the population.

23215 Sir Robert Keene.—You mentioned in the course of your evidence that the National system has been and is at present very extensively used in this country, with the co-operation, if not the approval of the Roman Catholic hierarchy?—Yes.

23216 Now, it has been so for the last thirty-six or years I think?—Perhaps not so long. I do not know the exact date—about the year 1836 I believe.

23217 For upwards of thirty years?—Yes.

23218 Now, do you think that Catholicism has lost any of its hold upon the feelings and belief of the Roman Catholic people in that interval of time?—So far as the National system is concerned, I do not think religion has suffered in this country from the selection or the co-operation which the bishops and priests have afforded to it. I think, on the contrary, that the National system, or the education of the people obtained through its means, has placed religious influences very much more within the reach of the poor than they were previously. As to the general question, whether religion is more powerful in the country now than twenty, or thirty, or fifty years ago, probably sentimental religion—if I may use the expression—is perhaps less powerful than it was in those times, whereas substantial religion, moving from people being well grounded in the knowledge and principles of their religion—has very much increased in the lower orders; and in the upper orders I think the advantage on the side of religion, with the progress of education, has been immense.

23219 Then, on the whole, do you consider that the result of the National system, with the amount of cooperation which it received from the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, has been beneficial to the country as the one hand, and to religion on the other?—The state of the people, with reference to religion, I think more satisfactory now than it was then. At the same time I should be slow to call it a result of the National system. I consider it the result of religious influences, which were more within the reach of the people on account of their being better instructed in elementary branches of knowledge. For instance, when I came out a young man to discharge the duties of a clergyman, I very often met very ignorant persons, conversed with what we understand as the "principal mysteries of religion"—devoid of Catechetical instruction on the Sacraments, and a variety of other details of our religious doctrines. Well, at those days, I really had no option except to look for a Christian Brother or for a Sister of Charity, if the person happened to be a female, or to take the case into my own hands, and give oral instruction to the party, which, considering my employment in carrying his daily bread, his want of punctuality, and a variety of other circumstances, was a long and a tedious, and a troublesome business. Now I have very little to do except to hand him a Catechism, and mark out for him a chapter, and say, "Read that well, and become acquainted with it, and come to me, and I will give you some farther instruction beside what you have already acquired." Of course religion is much more accessible to the people now than formerly, and in that way the result is more satisfactory.

23220 I gather from the general current of your evidence that you consider that education, as to its administration and management, should be entirely under the control of the ecclesiastical authorities?—The ecclesiastical authorities should be always able, by their influence, to secure the purity of faith and morals,

and also to ensure the exercise or introduction of religious influences into education; in fact, the general guardianship of faith and morals; and what you may call the management of the various details of Catholic practice, which influence education in a sense is amenable to religion, belong to the clergy and to the bishops, and they, whatever system is adopted, should be able to ensure that all these would be perfectly secured.

23221 In saying that, do you draw any distinction, or would you recognise any distinction, between the department of secular instruction, connected with the ordinary business of life, and the religious education?—I consider that, as far as secular instruction is concerned, the direct conveyance of the secular instruction does not belong to the clergyman or often any more than to any other person. He is often, not generally speaking, but often, as competent as secular persons to deal with secular matters, and act as a secular instructor, but he is not so in virtue of his office; but the authorities of the Church and their agents should be placed by any system in a position with regard to the working of the system, which would guarantee that into the secular teaching nothing contrary to Catholic faith or morals, or to the interests of religion, or detrimental to the spiritual welfare of youth of the Catholic religion, should be introduced, so that, with regard to the distinct religious teaching and to religious practices, of course that would be the direct and proper office of the Catholic Church in the matter of education. With regard to the merely secular department, it would be more of an inspection—more of a controlling character. It should be always in the power of the representatives of religious authority effectually to remove anything, even in the secular teaching, which would be in opposition to the teaching or practice of the Catholic Church.

23222 The position of the State with regard to education, you mentioned, should be limited absolutely to supplying the necessary funds for carrying it out?—Well, it is hard to embrace, in a general proposition exactly the exact expression of the distinctive authority that may be attributed to either the State or the church, or to any other influence in education. On that subject I have spoken rather with reference to my own individual views than to any objective doctrine that I suppose to exist on the subject.

23223 Would you recognise in the State the power of verifying the quality and the extent of the secular instruction by positive inspection?—If the schools were built and endowed by the State I would give the State the same authority and influence in each particular school that I would give a private individual who would endow a school for a specific purpose, and place the ecclesiastical or the religious management of the school perfectly in the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities; but I do not recognise in the State either any function for teaching or any equality for teaching. In fact, I consider that the teaching would not be a better matter any more than the providing by large contractors of goods for the army, the government, or anything else of the kind for being managed by the State. And therefore I should consider that the State would be just as bad an instructor as I would consider that it may be a bad gunmaker, a bad contractor for fangs for the army, in which the State often makes mistakes by not following the ordinary rules of commerce. I think freedom and liberty from restraint is as sound a principle in education as it is in trade. This, however, is a matter of opinion. Practically, if you allow a private benefactor the privilege of managing, within certain limits, the secular teaching of a school founded by him, you cannot refuse it to the State.

23224 But, looking at the State as personifying the aggregate of individuals whose the money is raised by the taxation of those individuals, and whose it is then given out by the State as the representative of the taxpayers for certain definite purposes, would you not admit it to be the province of the State to see that the money was properly applied, and that the results in-

Dec. 5, 1865.

Very Rev.  
Monsignor  
Levesque  
Paris, &c.  
&c.

Dec. 5, 1902.

Very Rev.  
Messrs. George  
Leeson,  
Dublin, &c., &c.,  
&c.

insland were equivalent to the expenditure I—I have already observed, in other parts of my examination, that I looked upon the action of the State in the matter as exceptional and transitory, and I hoped that it would not be necessarily permanent to a great extent. I have also stated that I should allow the State the same privileges that I should allow any private person who would endow a school, to secure results conformable to the views they would have in founding the school. But I should be sorry to see a state of things in which the State founded all the schools, and had the control and direction of education in all the schools. I think it would lead to very bad results, politically, socially, and religiously.

23225 If, as you mention, the direction and control of the religious instruction was freely accorded to the Church, with the power of seeing that nothing in the secular instruction, or in the books used for secular instruction, was either antagonistic to, or inconsistent with religious principles, would you require that the inspection of purely secular subjects should be conducted exclusively by persons of the religious denomination to which the school belonged?—You speak of mere secular instruction?

23226 Mere secular instruction?—Well, it would be most desirable that it should. At the same time, I would not object to the contrary as long as we should be under a denominational system. I think that there would be many things misunderstood by an Inspector of another religious persuasion or belief, in the very lessons that he would be examining the children in, and that, of course, it would be a sort of a lifeless exhortation, without soul, without character in it, if he was to confine himself merely to the purely material object of the reading lessons, for example, that would be before him.

23227 But in looking to the purely secular results of instruction, must he not confine himself to the actual formal reading, writing, and so on?—Yes; but suppose the Inspector were examining a paper in a reading lesson—it strikes me that the meaning of the passage would have a great deal to say to the merit of his performance as a reader, and that in order that his performance should be appreciated, the meaning of the passage should be understood by the examiner. Now, take the case—we are speaking of a denominational system—of a word-treating of a subject bearing on the distinctive religious belief—take a history, a geography, or even a spelling book, in which allusion was made, or the meaning of a word given of a peculiar or what would be called a sectarian tendency—all these things, I think, should be understood by the Inspector, in order to fit him for the discharge of his duty; and he could not be expected to understand them if he were of a different religious persuasion as well as he might otherwise.

23228 Then, on the whole, you consider it indispensable for a denominational school, that the Inspector should be of that denomination?—I did not say indispensable.

23229 But you prefer it?—Oh, much prefer it.

23230 In whom would you vest the appointment of the Inspector?—Well, that would be a matter of detail. If he be a person whose business it is to represent the interests of the Board as a public institution, and to ascertain the results of mere secular instruction, I have no objection to vest the appointment of the Inspector in the Board.

23231 Would you require his appointment to be approved by the ecclesiastical authority of the denomination to which the school belonged?—Well, I do not know that it would be absolutely essential to an Inspector, that he should be approved in his capacity of Inspector, but he should be, I think, approved as an unobjectionable person, as a person who would possess the confidence of the ecclesiastical authorities, that in the discharge of his office of Inspector he would do no mischief, that he would not go beyond his duty. I believe that, in England, the system is for the Inspector to be appointed by the Privy Council on Education. But, I believe, they always require

the approval of the bishop. I am not really acquainted with the system, but I think it is as I state.

23232 Practically it comes to that, but would you consider that that approval was necessary to a greater extent than that he should be a person of acknowledged moral character and position to whom no objection could be fairly raised?—I think the judgment of a person's moral character would certainly depend on the religious authority, because a person might be highly objectionable in a religious point of view, and still the Board might not at all consider him, merely humanly speaking, or materially speaking, a person that was not in every way fit. It would secure the harmonious action of the whole system, if both parties were controlled, and it would certainly be a deplorable thing if the Board were to send in, say, a person who was known not to live according to the strict rules of his religious persuasion. It would be a matter of bad example to children to have a person whose religious conduct were not altogether in harmony with the doctrines and teaching of religion, placed in a position of influence and authority over them.

23233 Then substantially you would have the Inspector appointed by the public authority, subject to the ecclesiastical authority?—Certainly, subject to the approval of the ecclesiastical authority.

23234 Now, have you had much experience of the State education in Catholic countries on the continent?—Well, I cannot say that I have had anything like detailed experience. I know pretty well how things go on in several Catholic countries, but detailed experience I really have not. It never was my business to make myself familiar with the details.

23235 Then you would not be able to speak as such a subject from your own personal knowledge?—No, I would not.

23236 The Christian Brothers to whom you referred in the course of part of your examination, are they in this country under the Government of the bishop in whose diocese their school is situated?—Well, I should say they are. That would be merely a legal point in the nature of their constitution. I am not familiar with the text of these, and therefore cannot say with great certainty; but for all practical purposes they are subject to the authority of the diocese in which they reside. They have a central authority which removes the members of the society back and forward, for instance puts this subject in one place or another according as his services are required, and as personal considerations might lend the authority to dispose of a subject sometimes in one place and sometimes in another. But once they are residing in a certain locality, I should say, I know in fact that they are subject to the authority of the diocese in all matters just as any body else.

23237 Then in case of their schools being taken as part of a denominational system, and of these schools being made use of as training institutions, do you think that no practical difficulty would arise from the gross independence or partial independence which they appear to have?—Well, I do not know that any practical inconvenience would arise, because their independence would simply amount to this, that a subject who might be considered very useful in a model school in Dublin might be considered by his superior more useful for a model school elsewhere, and might be sent away to the request of the locality in which he had been engaged previously, and perhaps to the advantage of the other locality. But once they are settled in a place they are not independent of the local ecclesiastical authorities. As far as the question of their undertaking the different training schools, I take for granted, speaking in general terms, that they would undertake it, but at the same time no one has authority to compel them or to speak for them but themselves in that matter. They would very naturally give the subject a good deal of anxious deliberation before they would come into contact with any external power that would seek to control their views of education.

23238 Do you consider that all persons seeking to become teachers in schools should be tested as to their

ability before being allowed to exercise that office?—I take for granted that their capabilities should be ascertained in some way or another as a matter of course. As to their being tested by an examination, that would be also a matter of necessity if their competency could not be otherwise ascertained. But I take for granted that no person is put into the office of teacher without being tested for it practically or otherwise. Every one who employs a teacher assumes that he is able to do his work for him, and Christian Brothers, I am sure, will not put a person into a school to teach until they first ascertain for themselves whether he is fitted for the office or not. In the same way the Sisters of Mercy, or other religious sisterhoods, will not set a sister who may have other capabilities of a very high order—to teach unless they know she is able to do it.

23338. If the State paid a contribution to the salary of the master or mistress, what guarantee should the State take for the proper capacity of that person?—I should say that it is their business to fix the guarantee. The ordinary straightforward way of deciding on the qualities of a person is by examination.

23340. Should you see any insuperable difficulty in testing in that way the teaching powers of the members of religious orders, in case they were extensively made use of for the function of teaching at the expense of the State?—Well, in general, I do not see any insuperable difficulty. A great deal would depend on the manner in which the tests would be applied, and the persons who would apply them. For instance, I would see greater difficulty in applying the tests of capacity to a community of religious ladies than to a community of religious brothers. I see a great deal more difficulty also with regard to religious ladies in applying tests by way of oral examination than by way of written examination. At the same time all these things would be matters of detail, and I am sure that with a disposition on the part of the external controlling educating body, on the part of the State, to make everything as little objectionable as possible to the parties they would have to test, and, on the other hand, with the wish of the religious ladies to make themselves as useful as possible in prosecuting the work of education, a satisfactory adjustment would be arrived at.

23341. You do not see any difficulty in principle which would stand in the way of that arrangement?—No; I do not.

23342. You mentioned that you look forward to a time when the Catholic body will be independent of the management of the State?—No; I do not.

23343. And that at present you contemplate deriving from the internal resources of the Catholic body at least a proportion of the funds to be applied to educational purposes. Now, where those funds would be provided by the Catholic body at large, by the Catholic laity of the country, would you contemplate the laity or any representation of the laity, taking any share in the management of such educational establishments?—Well, I contemplate the possibility of it, but certainly not the probability, because my experience is altogether the other way. We are very anxious to see the laity themselves about our schools, that they should visit them, and examine the children, and exert their influence in various ways over them; but they seldom or never set feet in them.

23344. Do you recognise that as a right on the part of the laity, or merely that you would allow them?—Well, as matters stand at present, certainly not as an explicit right, because the question has never arisen, nor has any system been adopted in detail for the securing or regulation of it.

23345. Then, in case of the establishment of a large system of denominational education, in which a proportion of the funds would be raised by a kind of voluntary assessment amongst the Roman Catholic laity, would you be prepared to admit as a matter of right the co-operation of the laity in the administration of those institutions?—Oh, certainly, I would con-

sider the question with reference to a local corporation of laity on the same principle that I would treat the question in its entire extent. If I should have no objection to allow the Government Board certain rights of inspection and control in return for the subsidy they would give, why should I have an objection to allow similar rights to a local board? But the matter should be considered in detail and the plan set forth, and then we should be better able to give an opinion on it; but in the abstract I should, in the supposed case, look upon the laity as partially the founders and benefactors of the institutions, and as such I should conceive that there is nothing inconsistent with principle in allowing them a certain amount of control and inspection in the regular department of the education.

23346. Would not such an arrangement by which the clergy would be brought into direct and thorough co-operation with the best portion of the laity be preferable, even in a religious point of view, to a system in which the clergy would hold as an isolated position entirely?—As a matter of fact, I do not think it would. I must say that I find myself always the better of a little advice from lay people, and I find the laity and myself get on much better together when we are brought into contact whether on public business of one kind or another, whether church building, or school building, or school supporting, or anything else of the kind that brings us together. I think it serves both parties. But, as a matter of principle, I think that the religious instruction and care of the children should be altogether in the hands of the clergy; as, with regard to the merely secular education, I have also already stated in my examination that I think the clergy would be very usefully and very beneficially assisted by the opinion and advice of the laity.

23347. Would not that come very nearly to the institution of the kind of school committee which Dr Sullivan referred to as being locally established for each school in France?—Yes, but I do not think the results, either to the school or to religion in general in the parish, would be altogether of a beneficial character. The position would be a difficult one for both parties which, however, might be diminished, if leaving to the parish priest the every day exercise in regard of the schools of his pastoral functions, the authoritative superintendence in the sense of religion were vested in an episcopal delegate. I repeat, too, what I stated in reply to Dr Sullivan, that practically I do not think the thing would work, for we do not find that the laity have time to attend these things. It is a mistake to imagine that the clergyman, because he has a great many other important avocations, has not time to attend to education. A clergyman looks on the education of the young in his parish as one of his most important duties, and therefore he must look after it, and he is accountable to his superiors if he do not. With regard to the laity, we know that their occupations are of a very expending character, and of a very constant character, and my experience moves me to the conclusion that they would not attend with any effect every time there would be a meeting for the purpose of the management of the school. I am quite satisfied they would not.

23348. But even if the heavy pressure of their ordinary business did throw upon the clergyman the trouble of managing the whole of the school affairs under ordinary circumstances would it not be well that they should reserve their right in any special circumstances they thought required it, of co-operating with the laymen?—I really do not know. I think I should be disposed to say that a right of interfering always, which would not be exercised or but seldom and on exceptional occasions, would give time to want of harmony of views, to contentions, and to difficulties between the clergy and the laity that do not exist at present. I should prefer that they should attend regularly and co-operate harmoniously from day to day or from week to week with each other, rather than that they should have no slightest right of interfering every day and never exercise it, except perhaps on an occasion that would

Dec. 8, 1888.  
Very Rev.  
Monseigneur  
Levesque,  
Paris, &c.,  
&c.

Dec. 8, 1869

Very Res.  
Messrs. the  
Learners  
Pelle, P.P.,  
&c.

will for it less than other occasions. Suppose the obliquity is in the habit of conducting the school in a certain way for years, if not with the active co-operation, at least with the consent of the members of this board, who never attend, but who are usually unwilling to leave it in the hands of the clergyman, well, it would be a very important thing, if a person becomes a member of that board, who chooses to have a hobby or a stick in some other direction, and he tries to interfere and regulate everything according to his own view, and to interfere with the progress of a machine that may have been working very satisfactorily for years. I think the proposed plan would give rise to difficulties of that kind which would be important; but in principle I do not see any objection to the lady interfering, and co-operating, and assisting and controlling to a certain extent the secular education on a small local scale, any more than on the entire surface of the question, by the operation of a board representing the State, or some external influence. If I would give it to the State Board in general, I would allow it as a matter of principle to the local board in particular.

2322 In the case of the denominational system as established in several parts of the Continent, the provision generally is that whenever the commune or parish is large enough to have more than one school the schools should be denominational, if the parish or commune is large enough to have two schools, that one of these schools should be Catholic and the other of whatever Protestant denomination is there; but in the case of a small commune where there is only a population sufficient to make one good school, that in such case the children of all religious denominations should have access to that school, and in that case there is no reason for their religious instruction being given separately, in a separate part of the building, and it is made the duty of the clergyman of each communion to give instruction to the children of his own communion. Would you consider such a provision as that applicable to those parts of Ireland where smaller small numbers of certain denominations are situated?—If you had the schools constructed in that way I should consider the provision not only not inapplicable, but the only one applicable. But of the same time I consider the question of education as another point of view. I consider that the having of children of different denominations in early life is bad on principle, and that separate religious instruction in that way conveys in itself a bad impression. What you describe is the least objectionable form in which the National system, as regards mixed schools, has ever presented itself, that is the form set forth in Lord Stanley's first letter, in which he provided for combined schools, with totally distinct religious instruction. That is, I think, the least objectionable form in which the system has presented itself; but at the same time I do think that it is still an objectionable form; for the very fact of presenting to the minds of children two forms of religion, each of which claims in theory to be the correct and true road to salvation, and still at the same time, each of which is obliged by external circumstances to pay an outward deference to the other, which the children feel in their conscience not only due to their own, must, I think, produce a bad impression on the children, and lay in that early part of their lives the very first seeds of indifference, or the idea that a person may very well go to heaven without any particular religion at all; and that you thus remove gradually, one after the other, the various, what are called, points of difference between religions, and reduce religions to one general form of Deism.

2323 But still you are inclined to think, if I interpret you rightly, that if the general system of the country were denominational, and that the population, as far as possible, was packed out into Catholic schools on the one hand, and Protestant schools on the other hand, still where there were any serious balance, if I may use such an expression, that as a mere matter of practical administration the principle might be adopted of applying to these residues of the population the united system as an exceptional arrangement?—I think

it would be useful and good in this sense at least, that it would be placing the question on its true basis; it would be a recognition on the part of the State that denominational education was the right thing, and that the contrary was to be considered a case rather of exceptional necessity than of recognized weakness. This alone would be a great advantage, because it would at once deprive those persons who are fond of promoting and propagating the mixed system as such, of all motive for doing so, because if there go out from the Committee or Board an officer of the Board, and that the object of that Board is understood to be the enforcing and propagating of the mixed system of education as the best thing through the country, you will find that every Inspector and every officer under the Board will, to a certain extent, make himself the apostle of that system. This is a great evil in itself, and is done away with when the Board faces the facts that it has to deal with, and says, "We recognize that the right system of education for the public, of whatever permanence they are, is denominational education." Once you have that principle recognized on the part of the Board, you give a great practical benefit, because you at once do away with all motive that Inspectors or other officers of the Board may have, or think that they may have, to urge the abstract value of mixed education on the people.

2324 In this sense the arrangement would be very good?—It would be an improvement of the present system; but I must decline to state how far my objection would be inseparable or otherwise to allowing schools of that kind at all, because they might be placed in circumstances in which it would be tolerable for Catholics to go to them, and they might be the very reverse; and all that must depend on persons who know the local circumstances and exigencies. On the other hand, I should say in general that I would much rather have a school in which there were a few Protestants, whom I would do my best to protect by a conscience clause, if there could be one inherently stringent provided, and have my school a Catholic school. I would much rather have that than allow a few Catholics under any care to go to a notoriously attended Protestant school. That I have an insuperable objection to, and I think I would then say differently rather than allow it.

2325 The arrangement you would prefer under these circumstances would be to have in such a locality where, we shall say, there were two-thirds Catholics and one-third Protestants—a school which would be still a Catholic school, but with a stringent conscience clause protecting the religious principles of the minority?—I prefer the arrangement that you speak of in a school where there would be two-thirds Catholics and one-third Protestants, but before making an arrangement for permitting one-third of Catholics, where there were one-third members of my flock, to go to a school where there were two-thirds of Protestants, I would go to any trouble and expense, if expense were needed, and exertion, to instruct those ten children, say, in a school of thirty, or get them instructed—to instruct them myself or get them instructed—rather than send them to a school, no matter what conscience clause there was, where there would be two-thirds Protestants.

2326 In answer to a question you referred to the case of persons sending children to England to boarding schools, as you mentioned, or to conventual schools in this country, rather than to the use of ordinary day schools?—Well, I had not the distinction present to my mind at all at the time. My experience of what families do certainly has more reference to boarding schools than to day schools, for this reason, that nearly all persons of the upper classes whom I know send their children to boarding schools. I have not in my parish, as I suppose you are aware, Sir Robert, a denominational day school for the upper classes;



what they do in the city of Dublin I really do not know.

23255 But do you not recognise a distinction between a boarding school where the domestic life is to be considered, where the child stands in circumstances similar to actual life in his family, and a day school, where he would only go for a few hours for the purpose of obtaining merely secular instruction?—Well, it might be a consideration in the mind of the parent that would make him feel less free to send his child to a mixed boarding school than to a day school. But, at the same time, I think the broad fact is there, that we have no such thing as even mixed day schools, as far as I am ascertain, in the education of people of the middle and upper classes. We have such things as schools conducted by masters who are exclusively Protestant, and schools conducted by masters who are exclusively Catholic; and, of course, I am aware of a few cases in which parents have sent their children to schools conducted by Protestant masters; but, at the same time, I do not think that they do it even from any approval of the mixed system, but, I think that whenever they do it, it is because those are generally schools where there is a training for competitive examinations, and things of that kind, that they think they cannot get so efficiently elsewhere; and, as success in these examinations is often the turning point in a young man's life, a Catholic parent may say, "I would much rather send my child to a Catholic school if I could; still what can I do in this case. I do not think there is a Catholic school in the city of Dublin where my child can be successfully prepared for his examination."—[I am merely putting an hypothesis; I am not offering an opinion on the merits of the schools; but this is the process of reasoning that goes on in the mind of the parent].—Each master has a great celebrity, and his pupils have always passed very well at the competitive examinations for Woolwich and Sandhurst, and the various places that it is an object for a young man in life to gain admission to. And the parents, balancing between the two considerations, may say, "In God's name we will run the risk and send the child; we hope that the master will not be unprincipled enough to make any bad impression on him, and the good impression he receives at home will neutralise any harm that may be otherwise done." Whether the fact is of frequent occurrence or not I cannot say, but I take it for granted that when it takes the reasoning process that I have described is what takes place in the parents' minds.

23256 What would be your opinion of an educational plan such as I shall try to describe to you? If the State, or the public authority of the State, said, "we will not interfere with or take any notice of religious instruction at all; we shall merely look after secular instruction; we shall pay, as it is termed, by the results of examinations in the subjects of secular instruction; and we shall leave to the managers of the school to deal with religious instruction absolutely as he likes, and he may have it of whatever denomination he belongs to or profess, or not have it at all if he likes; we shall simply give the public money for those subjects, which we considered to be the elements of purely secular education; and we shall be willing to contribute in that way to the support of any school, whether conducted by Catholics or Protestants, or conducted by persons who are neither Catholics nor Protestants; we shall pay equally to each upon the results of examinations?"—So far as you describe the notion it strikes me that it would be practically a denominational system; that if I further ask me my opinion on the subject, I will say that if the State dealt with managers that would say—"I prefer the mixed system of education in my school, and therefore I shall try to get Protestant and Catholic instruction for them, and make it as palatable as I can for all classes in that way," I simply think that the money that would be allowed for schools of that character would be wasted, as no person would go to them. The schools that I see [I suppose to be erected] would be either Protestant or Catholic.

23257 Yes!—And therefore would be denominational.

23258 Yes, but if the State expected that result, if the result came!—Oh, I thought you asked my opinion if the State proposed this plan, and my opinion would be that that would be the result.

23259 I ask you this, whether you, in your experience as manager of schools, and from your knowledge of the feelings and principles of the Church, would object to such a scheme, or be disposed to receive it and set upon it?—Unless there be something in it that I do not see at first sight, I must say that I do not think there would be anything to object in it; because I should get all I want, and others would get what they want. I would get what was most conducive for the secular instruction of the people under my charge, and would not see what other people got. I should be very glad that others get what would make their schools comfortable and efficient.

23260 Mr. Sullivan referred to a meeting held at Cork on the subject of intermediate education?—Yes.

23261 You were not present at that meeting?—Oh, no; I was not at it. I have even but a very faint recollection of it.

23262 Are you aware that the meeting to which reference was made was broken up by the entrance to very large bodies of a class of persons who were not those, that would be likely to avail themselves of intermediate schools?—Well, I have no very distinct recollection of it. You help me a little in the recollection of it, but the thing, so to speak, created no very distinct impression on my mind. I am willing to admit the fact, if you say you have a more distinct recollection of it. I remember distinctly the names of the clergymen, the Rev Dr Croker and the Rev Mr. Butler—who addressed the meeting, and took a leading part in neutralising its object. How it terminated, beyond a very vague recollection that is brought into my mind, I really cannot say.

23263 Are you aware that it was a meeting of the middle classes of Cork of such a position as that their children would be likely to attend intermediate schools?—Well, not from any historic recollection, except of the names of the two clergymen. I take it for granted, as it was a meeting for the purposes of intermediate education, and to consider the details of the matter, that the parties were of that class of life that you describe, but from a distinct historical recollection of what I then read of the meeting, I have no recollection at present.

23264 But do you consider that any conclusions should be drawn from the final result or resolution of that meeting, as the meeting was invaded by large bodies of the lowest population in Cork and the plot soon openly spoke, and the persons who originally convened and presided the meeting expelled from the building?—No, I should be slow to draw any conclusion, at least I should do it hesitatingly, from the resolution of any public meeting on any subject whatever, so far as it comes from a meeting, observe, and in particular, my conclusions on the subject of the system in which mixed or denominational education is held in this country are not derived from the resolutions of meetings at all. They are derived from my own observation of the manner in which parents deal with their children. With respect to a great number of these even amongst the laity who are supposed to favour in their conversation mixed education, I think that their views can be explained in the very same way that the views of the Catholic clergy and bishops are explained. They take a practical, and, so to speak, expediency view of the matter. They are doing the best with what they have before them. They may not distinguish as closely as persons who are in the habit of thinking more profoundly, though, perhaps, less practically, between the questions of principle and practice—as lawyers, for instance, or ecclesiastics might—but I think it amounts to the same thing. I am perfectly satisfied that the laity in general would, if they got a fair option and chance, prefer immensely the denominational system of education to the mixed system, and I may add, that I do

Dec. 8, 1860

Very Rev  
Messrs  
Lawrence  
Ferd. &c.,  
&c.

Dec. 8, 1891.

Very Rev  
Monsignor  
Lawrence  
Flood, &c.,  
&c.

not think that circum-stances being alike for all systems, they could, as it were to me, generally, have any other opinion on the abstract question, no matter what the justice may be in individual cases, which, as I said, must always be adjudicated on by a very accurate survey and consideration of the various circumstances in which not only each class but each individual is placed.

23265. Is it not possible that an individual, although recognising the superiority of denominational education as an abstract principle, and feeling it to be in a religious point of view more commendable, may still feel himself bound as a citizen of the State and studying the practical circumstances in which the population of the country are placed, to believe that on the whole the united system of education is more profitably useful, may be made consistent with the requirements of religion, and on the whole is more deserving of support?—As a general question I certainly think not.

23266. The *Objections*.—Supposing denominational schools existed over the country where there are sufficient children of two different communions, and that, as you suggested, in places where the minority were not able to maintain a school, a single school were maintained with a conscience clause, how would the conscience clause work with reference to those little religious observances coming in at stated hours, short prayers, and so on, to which you referred before, and to which you seem to attach considerable importance?—I think the question is one of course that, put in that way, refers to a Catholic school in which there would be a minority of persons of another religion. I never would contemplate the diminution of these practices. I should simply say that the majority should manage to put up with the inconvenience, that they should not be offended with everything they would see, or with everything that others would say in their presence, as long as the things were not in themselves offensive, and that they should look upon it as if they were unfortunately placed where there was a bad climate or any other material disadvantage.

23267. That they should stand by, passive spectators?—That they should either stand by or sit, just as they pleased themselves. I would not ask them to go on with any of these religious observances. Where I had a few children of different religious persuasions I would always try to make the occasions of observing the duties of religion as little frequent as possible; as I think it is a bad lesson to give children at all, and one which weakens the power of religion over them, to see persons, whether as masters, mistresses, clergymen, or others, whom they are obliged to have every sentiment of respect for, not of one view on what they all pretend to think the most important of all subjects. I think it must make a bad impression on them.

23268. Could you separate the secular and religious instruction sufficiently to give those Protestant children what the State would consider sufficient security?—Well, I should say that it would be impossible. I really was never placed in the position of being obliged to consider it much. If I had to mind or to take care of a school of the kind I would try to conduct it with as little offence, if the word is a proper one, to the children of another persuasion as I possibly could; but that is all I can say of it. I wish to have nothing at all to say to schools of the kind.

23269. Looking at the jealousy with which Parliament has maintained the conscience clause in England, do you think you could satisfy the requirements of Parliament in Ireland?—I really do not know even the wording of the conscience clause; so that I am not competent to give an opinion on the subject. I think the strong point of our position is the question is, that the people that require education are mainly Catholic, and that there is really no practical difficulty in getting up, in sixty-nine cases out of one hundred, Catholic and Protestant schools, and that the legislature and the Government should face the facts as they have them, and deal with them accordingly, rather than be conducting for the sake of a few isolated exceptional cases a system which is altogether disadvantageous

from beginning to end, and which is not in harmony with itself or with the wishes and feelings of the people.

23270. Mind you not also consider that the Parliament that votes the grants and holds the purse strings is in its majority Protestant?—Yes, but I think they ought to do justice to all classes.

23271. Would not that fact make them tremblers of obtaining security for Protestant minorities?—Well, I suppose it would. We are in the habit, in this country at least, of finding all parties that are in a position to control matters, very well inclined to protect Protestants, and to give them every possible advantage they can. When we had it so in this country we should not be surprised to find it was the case with the Parliament in England either. But, at the same time, we view the matter as it is in itself, and look for what is just and fair. We do not ask to interfere with the religion of any person, but we think that we have a right to the free exercise of our own.

23272. Mr. Sullivan.—Suppose in that case a practically denominational system were carried out, would there not be Catholic minorities to be protected in the north, where there are no schools for them, and Protestant minorities in the south, where there are no schools for Protestants?—Well, that is a question of statistics, but I believe the cases would be very rare and exceptional.

23273. But applying it only to the case where the minority would occur, how would you meet that case?—It would be always a question of what you consider a sufficient number to constitute or to admit of the establishment of a separate school for them. Of course according to the different view you take of that point you either restrict or extend the difficulty very considerably. I have thought over the matter, and the only remedy I should say for it would be to give the allocation of portions of the grant to the heads of the religious persuasions, to help according to their wishes the various localities according to their local wants. If there were Protestants in a locality where they could not well form a school with the ordinary resources of support, let them get some assistance from some central fund. But I really have been always led to think that the cases were purely exceptional, and it is very hard to deal with them. Neither Parliament or Government can possibly deal with the question in a strictly logical spirit, because in the end if there be only one person of a particular persuasion in the locality, you have got to upset the religious teaching of the entire neighbourhood for the sake of that one person. It is a great deal better that such a family should be subject to a little inconvenience as going and setting up somewhere else, just as if they could not find land to live on and should go elsewhere. If it were legally the duty of the Government or Parliament to protect minorities they should protect individuals, and I think that leads to absurdities.

23274. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are not there a few Protestant parishes scattered over the north and west of Ireland who could not be so easily disposed with in certain neighbourhoods from time to time?—I think a Catholic parishes are quite as good as a Protestant one in any neighbourhood, and that he will act as faithfully and is quite as deserving of confidence, no matter what neighbourhood he may be placed in.

23275. Then you propose to restrict the Catholic Constabulary to the south and west, and confine the Protestants to the north?—No; you will recollect I am not proposing a system at all. You give me a system, and I am stating my opinion of it. I have not proposed it. I am not proposing a system for the education of the few Protestants there may be in the country. I am only stating what I think the Catholics have a right to. They are the poorer population of the country, the most deprived of resources, and most thrown on themselves, and that I must say by masses not altogether out of the control of the governing powers, that were, at least, if not those that are. These are elements that ought to be taken into

consideration, and I think that the Catholic body ought to get a large amount of consideration and support on that account. If we adhere to strict principles in some cases only, and do not adhere to them in all we shall find that people will attribute the views we support to other reasons than a mere wish to advance the interests of education.

23276 Mr. Stokes.—Supposing that in removing all the regulations which restrict religious teaching, Parliament were to require from every school a certificate that no child had been excluded from the school on account of his religion, and that no child admitted had been forced to learn a religion contrary to the wish of the parent, would you, as manager of several schools, be able to give a certificate of that kind—that no child had been excluded from the school on account of religion?—Should I as manager of my own schools? Certainly; but, at the same time, I must be allowed to add, that if the system were practically a mixed system, I should not be able to give that certificate, in other words, that I would not co-operate with that system. But, as a matter of fact, no Protestant child ever thinks of coming to my schools, because there are Protestant schools in the neighbourhood, and no Protestant child wishes, ordinarily speaking, to be instructed by Catholic instructors, and vice versa.

23277 If all restrictive rules were waived, would not you naturally avail yourself of the freedom that you and other managers would enjoy to conduct schools in accordance with your own views, religious and otherwise?—Well, I certainly should.

23278 In that case you would not see any great objection to that certificate which I mentioned?—Well, there are two ways of excluding a child from school; you will exclude a child either by shutting the door and saying "this is a Catholic school, and you are a Protestant and cannot come into it," or you will exclude a child of Protestant parents by carrying on practices in school to which Protestant parents would have a reasonable objection. Now, I must say that, without consideration, I do not see any way of cure of carrying on a really Catholic school to which a Protestant parent would have no objection.

23279 That second exclusion would be perfectly admissible probably, but do you not think that it would be an advantage for the Government to exercise no special views at all in the matter?—Would they not be exercising a supervision by the very fact of asking this certificate?

23280 You do not agree with me in thinking that that would be merely one step towards extending the protection of the State to all others, without any oppression of the majority?—Well, I must say that, as far as I understand the question, it would be rather mistaking the action of the instructor and mistaking the action of the State than anything else, because practically the case is thus:—the school is either a Catholic or a Protestant school, and if it is a Catholic school I do not see how a Protestant would have any wish or inclination to be in it, and if a Protestant school, it is the other way; so that I cannot see any practical use of that certificate. I do not understand the machinery of which it would form a part, in fact.

23281 The machinery would not in this way, that in order that the school might annually draw the stipend of the master and the other allowance to which, after examination, it was found to be entitled, that certificate must be produced from the manager of the school, and that if the manager would not give it, then he would forfeit his right to the grant?—But, except it be as an expedient, I really do not see any other utility that this condition would have; because what purpose would this certificate serve? If I am to get my grant for a denominational school, what is the use of the Government requiring any further certificate about it. If it is a school that gives a good secular instruction, and the Government sends in an Inspector to see that the money is properly spent in giving a good secular instruction, I do not see what utility there is in requiring this additional certificate from a school which is understood to be purely denominational.

23282 Do you not consider it an advantage to get rid of the necessity of forming two classes of schools, one in large places where there may be Catholic and Protestant schools, and the other in the small places, where the population could only sustain one school, and that without necessitating an inquiry on the part of the State, as to the wants and wishes of the population?—Well, it strikes me that if the wants and wishes of the population are considered, the State merely withdrawn more out of the question by it, so to speak, and leaves people to deal with it themselves; but I do not think the morality of the question is altered by it at all, because if you suppose certain duties to belong to the State, which I do not admit, they ought to look their duties straight in the face, and discharge them, and not try to get out of them by throwing the responsibility on individuals.

23283 With respect to those religious practices which you spoke of, are they commonly carried on in the schools under secular teachers?—Well, I should say more or less they are. At the same time, it is almost impossible for a person so little gifted with powers of description as I am, exactly to describe, or explain them, or show the effect of them. I can give you a passage delivered by a gentleman better capable of description than I am, at a meeting held in Dublin, who dealt with the subject very graphically in advocating the necessity of allowing those practices publicly in schools. He concluded with this observation which I think is very forcible. After describing the various ways that these little appliances and inducements may be brought to bear, he speaks in this way:—

"I am convinced that the influence of this religious atmosphere is more powerful, more penetrating than the influence of religious instruction, strictly so called, or of controversial teaching, or of learned lectures. For a Protestant child sits the midst of Catholic people, and let him be surrounded by Catholic practices, speak to him not of religion, never best a word of controversy, and in nine cases out of ten the child, of his own free accord will become a Catholic. Yet this is the very influence we are forced to brush from our own schools, by the system of mixed education."

So that every Catholic child in these mixed schools loses an amount of religious influence which would be practically sufficient to make a Catholic of any Protestant child.

23284 Can you say, as a manager of schools under secular teachers, whether in those schools the Anglican is always said?—Well, I cannot say always—that is always in every school; but I take it for granted it is said in all of my own schools.

23285 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is that a matter of fact, do you know?—As a matter of fact, I have already told the Commissioners that I cannot speak for the daily action of my schools. I am engaged in other matters of ecclesiastical administration, and I am not the official manager of any of my schools at present, so I really cannot speak as to the matter of fact. That was the rule of the parish when I was a curate in it, nearly twenty years ago, and a good many of the same disagreements are there, and the same traditional management was, I know, continued during the interval, and since I returned as parish priest, and I take for granted the same practices are still observed.

23286 And should I understand you to say that the same practices are generally observed in National schools throughout the country?—I do not know of National schools throughout the country, but I know that, in Catholic schools under Catholic management throughout the country, without speaking of any particular or definite practices, there is a sufficient amount of religious influence brought to bear during not only particular hours in the day, but also during the entire day, which is very powerful in maintaining that Catholic atmosphere about the children.

23287 Our reference is just now as to these practices. Can you speak decidedly on that?—I have already stated that I am not gifted with sufficient powers of description even to go through, in my

Dec. 6, 1898

Very Rev.  
Messrs.  
Lawrence  
Poole, & Co.  
&c.

Dec. 8, 1897.  
 Very Res.  
 Messrs.  
 Larnach  
 Park, &c.,  
 &c.

creditable way, a list of these practices. They are influences that are certainly at work in all Catholic schools more or less, and where they are at work they exercise a powerful and a lasting effect. We cannot see these influences to the same extent of all in our schools, as at present conducted, as we could if they were purely denominational schools, but we cannot eliminate them altogether from our schools, for the very presence of the clergyman is an influence in itself, and the very fact of seeing the clergyman there as a superior person in the school, not as the servant of anybody, but in the position which religion gives to a clergyman, as most respected on account of his religious character—the fact of the children seeing the clergyman before them in that capacity is in itself a religious influence.

23288. But just to come to the one point. Should we understand you to say that in the ordinary National schools throughout the country, under Roman Catholic management, the practices to which you have referred—the Angelus, say, at twelve o'clock—are observed?—I have already said that I know nothing of what the ordinary daily practices are in schools throughout the country.

23289. You have stated that since the condemnation of the model schools by the bishops, that Roman Catholic teachers are placed in these institutions in a false position spiritually?—I did not use the word "spiritually."

23290. I thought I took down correctly what you said. What did you say on that point?—I do not recollect, but I am certain those are not the words I used.

23291. And, then, should we understand you to say that they are not placed there in a false position spiritually?—They are certainly placed there in a false position towards their religious superiors.

23292. In what way?—They are placed in a position of dissenting and standing in carrying out a system which they know is not only not approved of by their religious superiors, but positively condemned.

23293. But if they do not feel it to be a system condemned in the forum of their own conscience?—That is exactly the very reason why I objected to your introducing the word "spiritual" in the notice. I introduced the word "religious" because we have in our religious system the distinction very clearly marked out between the forum of each one's own conscience, which is spiritual, and the external responsibility he has towards his religious superiors and the relations that he has towards them.

23294. I should not have used the word if I was not under the impression that you used it.—At the same time will you allow me to complete my answer by saying that a Roman Catholic considers himself in the forum of his own conscience, subject to the guidance and direction of his religious superiors.

23295. Is this matter?—In this matter.

23296. And if so, how should you account for the fact that there are so many Roman Catholic teachers in the model schools, and pupil teachers, conscientious persons, and in full communion with the Church?—I do not believe that there are very many. I believe that they are there under very strong temptation; and as to the question of communion with the Church, whether it is left or not, I must leave that question to be answered by the local ecclesiastical authorities. I do not know whether they are in full communion or not, but I know this, that they are looked upon as being in an exceedingly difficult position for conscientious Catholics to be in.

23297. Have you reason to believe that those teachers themselves regard themselves as in a peculiarly unfortunate position?—I think so, you see, I do not know how they regard themselves. They may consider themselves, according to their way of viewing things, as very fortunate, because they get perhaps large salaries.

23298. But in connection with that, did I not understand you to say a short while ago that there was a positive injury to young men in being trained in these model schools?—I said something of that tendency, and I repeat it.

23299. But is there not a positive benefit to these young men in receiving good salaries?—But you are referring to different parties altogether. It may be a great advantage to teacher A to get a large salary as master of a model school, and it may be a great disadvantage to pupil teachers in training, B, C, D, E, and all the rest, who are, by being trained in a model school, put outside the number of those who can be after a certain date engaged by the managers of nearly all the schools throughout the country.

23300. If so, how do you account for the fact of so many of these young men filling up the vacant places in the model schools, and coming in when the vacancies arise?—I don't know. That is a question for each person to decide for himself. I take for granted that present good has a great influence in any person's determination; and if he gets a good situation in the model school he is rendered so far independent of the prospects that would await him if he had to take his chance in the ordinary schools of the country.

23301. If there is a positive disadvantage to young men, and a certainty of sustaining injury, would not that soon tell upon the entire community, and deprive the model schools of the supply of young men?—It has told on them. If you speak of teachers, that is one question, and if you speak of pupil teachers, that is another.

23302. Are there any persons excluded from the sacraments owing to their teaching in these model schools?—I am not in contact with any of the model schools and therefore I cannot say from my own knowledge.

23303. Did I understand you to say that since the condemnation of the model schools they were excluded from the sacraments?—No, sir, you did not. I did not say it. I really do not know what the Church discipline of each locality is. The authorities are very cross-purposed and very pendent, and they regulate themselves altogether in the discipline of their own functions in that matter according to the circumstances of the place. It may be a very correct, and proper, and advisable thing to enact severe penalties and enforce a rigid rule in one place and very lenient in another.

23304. But is not the system uniform and under one head?—What system, say I.

23305. Your own system?—Certainly, but it is not an iron rule that binds every person to think, and to act in the same way, regardless of circumstances, just as if they were all parts of a machine moved by one spring.

23306. Would it be on the ground of conscience that the teachers or parties going to these model schools to be trained would be deprived of the sacraments?—It would be for the violation of a law or edict of the Church. It is not with reference to an individual conscience that laws or general regulations are made. If you ask for the general principle by which ecclesiastical conduct themselves in the exercise of their authority, it is what St. Paul says in speaking of the authority of the Church, that "it is given for the purpose of edification and not for destruction." That is a principle that guides us very much. If we find that a rule is more to be the occasion of its own violation by being too stringent or too strict, we are cautious how we make it. If we find on the other hand that the rule is likely to be an efficient deterrent from committing wrong, or going in the way of danger and wrong, we make it with less hesitation.

23307. Well, then, in its operation is it the result of expediency?—Is what?

23308. The application of that principle?—Certainly not; it is the result of a wise discretion and of careful deliberation in each particular case of the obligation of the particular rule of that portion of the Church.

23309. If conscience operates in the matter how is it that it applies on one side of the river and not on the other?—Well, I really cannot undertake to explain the matter further.

23310. For instance, if the teacher of a model school in Derry were deprived of the rites of the Church in Derry, and could get those rites by crossing the bridge

to the Waterford?—I really do not know. You must consult the authorities of Kerry for that.

23311. With regard to such a locality as Limerick, where the influence of the Catholic bishop and clergy is opposed to the model schools, should you say that the teachers there were likely to be deprived of the rise of the Church?—I know nothing of Limerick.

23312. Should you prefer that children should attend any of the model schools in this country to their stopping away from school altogether?—Well, in the present circumstances I should prefer their stopping away, because their stopping away in the present circumstances would be altogether a voluntary act of their own. They have other schools to go to; therefore I should prefer very much at present their stopping away altogether to their going to a model school.

23313. But should you think it a legitimate exercise of clerical authority to prevent them attending?—Oh, every person who exercises authority must think for himself.

23314. But should you, may I ask?—I am not in authority, and have not a model school, so that you will excuse me from giving an opinion on a matter of the kind.

23315. May I ask is there any necessity that they should stop away?—What do you mean by necessity?

23316. There are some Roman Catholic children who attend model schools?—Very few.

23317. Is there any necessity that they should stop away?—I really do not know. If you tell me the model school, and introduce me to the party, I will speak to the party, and give him my opinion.

23318. Let us take the case of Limerick. The Limerick model school is a little out of the city, and the children to go to it require to pass the convent school, and a necessity does not exist in that case. How do you account for their passing the convent school and going to the model school?—I suppose because they like it. I really do not understand why. They are free agents, and they pass it by if they choose to disobey the advice they get; and that is all about it. No person imagines that all Catholics do everything that they are obliged to do. We should be a very happy community indeed if we did.

23319. Mr. Stokes.—May it not be concluded from an observation of the different cases up and down the country, that the consideration which weighs with the bishops in reference to those model schools is that where there is no suitable place such as religious schools for the education of the children, they may extend a larger toleration to the model schools than they do where there is a good school for them; as for example—you know Thur—at Thur there is a convent school, and the bishop of the diocese I understand has prohibited girls from going to the model school; but there is no suitable school for the Catholic boys, so the attendance of boys at the model school is still tolerated. Would not that be a general explanation of what appears to be a curious difference in the treatment of different places?—That would be a general explanation. That principle operates to a certain extent here in Dublin, even. We have a model school here in the neighbourhood, and two or three of them in Dublin. Well, some of them are very much under the ban of the clergy. All of them are comprised in the general disapprobation of them, but we do not wish to say to the people,—that is, by a general rule,—“You will be communicating a sin, you shall be refused the sacraments, if you send your child to that school”—until we have provided sufficient opportunities for their going elsewhere. And we are doing this, thank God, very rapidly, and when the proper time comes I suppose we shall take the proper action. We find our people very willing to obey us, and to take not only our strict instruction, but even our counsel and advice, but we should be very slow to give a command that would place a parent in the difficulty of saying “we have no school to send our child to.” That is, in fact, what I meant when I observed that the Church “does not use her authority for the purpose of destruction, but for edification.” It means, too, what is frequently conveyed by the familiar phrase, that it is frequently “easier to lead than to drive.” It is a matter for the ecclesiastical superior to determine which he deems the best course, and the most likely to succeed.

[Adjourned.]

Dec 8, 1868.  
Very Rev  
Margaret  
Lambert  
Ford, P.P.,  
&c.

# FIFTY-NINTH DAY.—DUBLIN, DECEMBER 9, 1868.

## PRESIDENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of FOWLE, Chairman.

Sir ROBERT KANE, P.R.  
WILLIAM BRIDGES, Esq., M.C.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.

SCOTT NASHBY STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.  
LAURENCE WALSHAM, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } Secretaries.  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq., }

JAMES DUFFY, Esq., SWORN and EXAMINED.

23320. The Chairman.—Were you the publisher of a book written by Mr. Mahony: a book compiled by him, one of the Inspectors of schools under the National Board?—I do not know whether he is an Inspector or not, but he was not at the time I published the book.

23321. When was the first edition of that book published?—I think about twenty years ago, in 1848.

23322. On the title page of that edition what was the Christian name or initials of Mr. Mahony?—C. Mahony.

23323. When was the second edition published?—The second edition was published this year.

23324. What are the initials in that second edition?—It is D. Mahony in this one, I suppose by mistake. I think it must be a mistake of the printer.

23325. Mr. GILSON.—Are the books the same in their text?—The same.

23326. The preface the same?—No; the preface is not the same. The preface to the original one was too long, and I considered it useless and put it out of the second edition.

23327. The Chairman.—Some reflections were made upon the fact that the two editions had different initials of the Christian name, as if it had been desired to destroy the identity between the two editions?—No, that is not the case. It was purely a mistake of the printer, and it escaped my notice in correcting the proof-sheet.

23328. Is the change of letter a thing for which Mr. Mahony is at all responsible?—He has nothing whatever to do with it. I never saw Mr. Mahony from

Dec 9, 1868.  
James Duffy,  
Esq.

Dec 9, 1868. the time the first edition was published, nor was I aware of his residence or anything connected with him from that to the present time.

James Duffy,  
esq.

23329. Sir Robert Keane—Does the copyright of that book belong to you?—Yes, sir.

23330. And in bringing out the second edition you did not think it was necessary to communicate with Mr Mahony?—I lost sight of him for twenty years, and I did not know where to find him. He was then a student in Maynooth College. From that time I never heard of him.

23331. As a matter of fact you did not communicate with him in regard to bringing out the second edition?—No.

23332. Was the only object in modifying the preface in the second edition the mere abridgment?—I did that myself. I considered the other preface too long and useless, and I left it out of the second edition, but Mr. Mahony had nothing to do with it.

23333. It was not for the purpose of retracting or modifying any opinions expressed in the previous edition that the change was made?—No, sir.

23334. And Mr Mahony was quite unconscious of any such alteration?—He knew nothing whatever about

it. If I wished to communicate with him about it I did not know where he was. I did not know he was living at all.

23335. You had originally purchased the copyright of the book from Mr Mahony?—Yes, sir.

23336. So that his property in the book ceased altogether?—He had nothing whatever to do with it then.

23337. Mr Stokes—Is the Commission distinctly to understand that Mr Mahony did not revise either the title page or any part of the second edition?—He did not. I never saw Mr Mahony from shortly after the first edition was published. I never saw him since. I never had any communication with him, nor did I know where he resided.

23338. Master Brooke—The second preface was written by yourself?—No, it was abridged. There was a long dissertation in the first one, on historical matters, and I abridged it in the second edition.

23339. It was substantially his writing, the short preface?—Yes, I might have put in a word here and there to connect some portion of it, but nothing more.

23340. Rev Dr. Wilson—Are we to understand that anything done in the way of abridgment was purely your own act?—Purely my own act.

JAMES WILLIAM KEVANHUGH, Esq., further examined:—

James Wm  
Kevanhugh,  
esq.

23341. Rev Dr. Wilson—In reference to your letter written from Greystones, should I understand you to convey the impression, or seek to convey the impression that the Commissioner who produced it obtained it by some dishonourable means?—Not dishonourable, in relation to the Commissioner, so far as I know, but eminently dishonourable in relation to the parties who supplied it to the Commissioner.

23342. On the 28th November, when you were here—on Saturday week—in answer to my question, you testified that, "all the previous part which I have just read he" [Dr Wilson] "wholly omitted. Dr Wilson wholly omits 'Greystones, Delgany,' he omits all reference to the subject-matter of the letter—the name 'Emancipatory,' or any reference to it never occurs, directly or indirectly, to show what the document really is, thereby totally altering the meaning of the passage quoted, which would be understood only from the context," and so on. Now, was there any design, do you think, on the part of the Commissioner, in omitting any parts of that letter?—I think, *provisis factis*, any one who would hear the letter, in its full details, read, when he had heard the mutilation and garbling, could have no second opinion that it was made to place me in the position of recommending the creation of model schools, whereas the real drift of the letter and its whole object was urging that a model school should not be established in the particular place, Enniscorthy, but incidentally, I say to the Commissioners that there are many towns where you have not inquired whether the model schools are desired or not. Try, in these few places named, and if the model schools are desired, why then establish them.

23343. On the 13th of July, instead of attempting in any way to take you unawares, did I not, before quoting the letter, or a portion of it, which I read, supply you with the date?—A date, in an active official life of a quarter of a century, could be of little service to me, in fixing the subject of a letter, written more than twelve years ago.

23344. Should we understand you to say you did not discover the letter and the character of the letter the moment I referred to it in July last?—I do not think I should be asked the question, I have so often and so distinctly stated that I was wholly ignorant of what the real subject-matter of the whole letter was, when that portion of it was read by you.

23345. Had you not previously before this Commission, in regard to that very letter, supplied us with the date, which date I gave?—I did not catch your question.

23346. Had you not previously, before this Commission, with regard to that very letter, supplied us

with the date?—No, not with the precise date—with the year, only.

23347. Do you not recollect saying, on the 11th July, "I beg to remind you that I applied to the Board, through their secretary, for the letter, but the letter is not produced"?—No, I do not think I said that. It must have been a misprint in the proof.

23348. Again, "I applied to this Commission for it, and Lord Parnell was kind enough to order the letter"?—Very true. That is what I did say, and these must be a mistake on the other.

23349. Some day you said: "Ten years ago I published this letter in this book of mine, that they could not go back from the promise they had made"—That is, the Board's Order, on my letter, refusing to abandon the project.

23350. Do you recollect upon that very occasion you also stated, in answer to Dr Sullivan, "I was then living at Greystones? There was no bishop of the diocese. The bishop, Dr Murphy, had just died, and without consulting any person, such was my knowledge of the locality," and so on?—I did state all that, and all of which is true.

23351. Do you not recollect on the 13th July, one of the first questions I addressed to you was that, "do you recollect writing a letter on the 29th August, 1856"?—I dare say you asked me the question. What is the answer, please?

23352. "I cannot recollect," was your answer. "Read the letter, and I will answer it"—Quite right.

23353. Do you not recollect immediately after I began to read your letter, and before I questioned you in reference to it, you interrupted me by declaring, "My missing letter? my missing letter?" or words to that effect?—I may have done so, but I beg to tell you, once and for all, if by this sort of questioning you want to get out of me the admission, contrary to fact, that I was aware, when you read the passage, of the identical letter from which it was detached, that your time and the time of the Commission is lost. I beg to state, solemnly, that I did not know then, nor for days after the letter was read, to what subject it referred. That will close my examination on the point, and I trust you will not ask me again.

23354. Do you recollect you immediately recognised the letter as your own, of the date and time and object indicated, as explained by your answer that very moment?—No answer that I gave, or could give, or that I can ever give, could explain what you have now said. I knew nothing, whatever, save the date of the letter, or rather of the extract from it.

23355. Mr Stokes—Would you like to have a copy

Dec. 8, 1895  
James W.  
Barroughs,  
esq.

of the letter?—No, thank you, Mr. Stokes, my memory is very clear on the point.

23355. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Having read the portion of the letter giving you the date, I put to you the question, "Did you write that?" and your reply is, "I am proud of having written that letter. I am obliged to you for exhuming it?"—Yes, I did—a very proper answer to give, perfectly consistent with my whole life. I added more, that is not reported—if these people want you to exhumate them, in the way of education, go there, but if not, shake the dust from your feet and depart that town. From my boyhood there have been my opinions, and I have never modified them, never departed from them.

23357. Now, do you not recollect saying on the 28th November, when here, "You omitted even where I might know, for I was living at Geytonston, Delaplay, and it being a model school, the subject might have persuaded me of it, and it was only when time brought this to my mind that I thought this might be the case, and I went to the *Premosa's Journal* office, and searched the files of the year 1852 for copies of the two letters that I wrote to the Earl of Carlisle, giving an account of the visit I made to the Emuethy Model School, being the historian of its failure as I was the prophet of the same?" And in answer to another question which I put—"Did you not recognise the connection between what I read and the previous part of the letter as portions of the communication which you wrote at Geytonston?"—your reply was, "I did not, and for many days after I was thinking of what it might be, and it was only in the use of its being part of the Emuethy letter that I went as a *desperate resort* to try in the *Premosa's Journal* for it." To which do you adhere, your evidence of July or your evidence of November?—I do not know anything in the two statements that conflict. Place, in proper form, the two statements that appear to you to conflict.

23358. Mr. Gibson.—There was some little difference of opinion between you and me, and I wish, if possible, to have it reconciled?—So do I, if it can be done, and it will not be my fault if it cannot.

23359. I put this question to you—"From the time the Presbyterian body joined the Board in 1840 until 1856, the construction inevitably put upon the rule of the Board for religious instruction, as the condition on which they joined, was, that it devolved upon the parent to withdraw his child from religious instruction of which he disapproved, but that the patron should not compel any child to attend or be present at such religious instruction." Do you contradict that statement? And you said "distinctly?"—"Decidedly" was my answer, I think, Mr. Gibson.

23360. If I modified that question in this way—from the time the Presbyterian body joined the Board—from 1840 until 1856—the construction put upon the rule of the Board for religious instruction by that body, as a condition on which they joined, was, that it devolved upon the parent to withdraw his child from the instruction of which he disapproved, and that the patron should not compel any child to receive or be present at such religious instruction—would your answer be the same?—I could not answer such a question.

23361. Then I shall ask you a further and an important question. You are aware of the Corcoran case, I presume?—Yes, and I have inspected that school lately.

23362. The Corcoran case is dated January 24, 1840. Up to that time had the Presbyterian body, as a body, connected themselves with the Board?—Not as a body. They attempted to connect themselves, in 1833, but did not succeed.

23363. It was on the results of that application that they did connect themselves with the body?—Yes.

23364. I will have to read this communication. I think it right to tell you that is only part of it—I would rather have it in full, if it is put in it at all.

23365. It is addressed to the Commissioners of National Education, and signed by Robert Stewart as

patron of the school. The name of the school is Corcoran. It is situated in the townland of Corcoran, in the parish of Skerry, barony of Lower Antrim and county of Antrim. "The times for reading the Holy Scriptures and for catechetical instruction are so arranged as not to interfere with or impede the scientific or secular business of the school, and no child whose parents or guardians object is required to be present, or take part in those exercises; and no obstruction shall be offered to the children of such parents receiving such instruction, elsewhere, as they may think proper." Is that passage before you?—Yes.

23366. Now, was not that the rule of the statement rather upon which the application for aid was granted by the Board of Commissioners, and which was to be the model, if I might so speak of future applications to the Board from members of the Presbyterian body?—It was the application, but it is the decision, or Board's Order, on that application, by the Commissioners, that is to be the model of all future ones, not the application, itself.

23367. Do you mean to say that was not known by the name of the model application?—Yes, amongst Presbyterians.

23368. Was this Corcoran application not known in common parlance as the model application of the Presbyterian body?—Typical, we will call it.

23369. Answer the question, yes or no?—I have answered it.

23370. Na, you have not, with great respect. I want to know whether you cannot say that this was called the model application upon which the applications from the Presbyterians were to be framed?—So it is called, but I want to distinguish between the application, as such, and the decision on it, which alone bound both the Board and also the parties who accepted aid under it.

23371. From the time this grant was given upon this application was the inquiry sheet ever sent to the patron of the school making the application?—Not from about this date, but it did not arise at all, as a consequence of the Corcoran case.

23372. Answer the question?—I have answered it.

23373. I ask you to answer the question. Was the inquiry sheet ever sent to the patron of the school after that date?—I can give no answer but what I have given.

23374. Was it after that date always sent to the Inspector and not to the patron?—Yes, but not as a consequence of that Corcoran application. From 1831 to 1833, applications for aid were decided on by the Board, without any visit or report being made by the Inspectors, arising, mainly, from the inadequacy of the staff to reach on that class of duty. But, after February, 1833, when twenty-five Inspectors were appointed, and a local corps regularly organized, all applicant cases had to be referred to the Inspector who visited, verified the grounds alleged for aid, and reported his opinion of the merits. This change took place the year before the Corcoran application.

23375. Do you consider that Dr. Cooke's words would be a proper and reliable manner of evidence as to what the body at large intended, at all events when they connected themselves with the Board after the date of this Corcoran application?—I do say that Dr. Cooke is an honorable and reliable witness in any matter connected with the question generally, but his evidence is not of the slightest weight in any mind compared with rules and reports that bind the Commissioners, and that bind Dr. Cooke, and all other patrons.

23376. Did the General Assembly or Synod of Ulster ever bind themselves otherwise than in this Corcoran application, that no obstruction should be offered to the children of such parents receiving such instruction elsewhere as they thought proper?—They did bind themselves to exclude the children.

23377. At what time?—At the time they joined the Board, in January 1840.

23378. Subsequently to the date of this Corcoran application?—As an essential condition of obtaining aid in the Corcoran case, the jointed with the rule of the

Dec. 9, 1890  
James Wm  
Kavanaugh,  
sq.

Board, starting all applicants in the fact, but especially brought out into relief, such as before or since it never had been, in order to let the Presbyterians know that this obligation is exclusive was of the essence of the rules binding them.

23379 Was it not stated again and again that the Presbyterian Church was bound only by the principle involved in this *Corbett* case—"no obstruction shall be offered to the children of such parents receiving such instruction elsewhere, as they think proper?"—If you allow me I will read the view the Board took of it. 23380 Please answer the question either yes or no, and then say anything you like?—I am a bad authority as to what the General Assembly said, but, as understood, except so far as public documents are concerned, but I know what the Board did say, and it is to that I will adhere myself, as the real evidence.

23381 Now, I hold in my hand a letter, which appears to have been published on the 1st February, 1840, a short time after the *Corbett* application. It is addressed by the Rev Henry Cooke to the pastors ruling Presbytery and Churches of the Synod of Ulster. "Reverend fathers,—That our school committees followed their own regulations agreeably to the Synod's 5th proposition, and are bound by them and there alone, and not by any other whatsoever." Will you contradict that statement?—Point blank.

23382 Now I must read again. The Synod's propositions to which he referred were four, and I will read the third, which is the only one bearing upon this subject. "That all children whose parents and guardians shall so direct, shall daily read the Holy Scriptures, during the period, but that no compulsion whatever be employed." That was the proposition submitted?—That is their proposition, but there is not, and never has been any contradiction or conflict between that proposition and the more important one of the Board which includes that proposition.

23383 Mr. Stokes.—Are you of opinion that the National Board followed with this question in a double sense?—I am certain they did not, until 1847. If I am allowed and that three or four point blank questions are put to me, I engage by official documents, in fifteen minutes, to settle the question.

23384 Master Brooke.—Upon that point I confess my mind is quite unsettled when I compare the statement of the rule in the year 1838, in the 5th Report, page 135, with the alterations of that same rule in the year 1847, in the 6th report. Compare these two, and tell me can you suggest why the Board changed in so remarkable a manner the expression of that rule. In the year 1838, the rule was this. It is the Subsection of the second division as to religious instruction, "That where any course of religious instruction is pursued in a school during school hours, to which the parents of any of the children attending it object, the manager shall make an arrangement for having it given to those who are to receive it at a stated time or times, and in a separate place, so that no children whose parents or guardians object to their being so shall be present at it." An arrangement must be made so that no children whose parents object to the instruction shall be present at it? Now that would have been a difficult thing for the Synod of Ulster to swallow with these expressed views, and in 1847, the next time in which I find any statement of the rule, I find it altered into this ambiguous form, "The parents of the several schools have the right of appointing such religious instruction as they think proper, provided the schools be open to children of all communions, that due regard be had to parental right and authority, that accordingly no child be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object," and so on. We have heard about Archbishop Stopped refusing to accept and from the Board until that passage had been explained in his own sense, and it was obviously a most ambiguous sentence, and totally different from the direct plainness of the rule published in 1838. Under that ambiguity, there would seem to be sufficient reason for the Synod of Ulster to adopt the construction most

favourable to their own view; therefore I ask you who stand up for the integrity of the conduct of the Board, in this matter, to tell me how you explain that alteration?—The rule, quoted by you, was introduced in May, 1838. In the previous year, 1837, Mr. Blake, one of the original Commissioners, the Rev Mr. Carline, another of the original Commissioners, and Dr. Kelly, the original secretary, were all minutely examined, on this rule, as to evidence of immaturity, before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Education, Ireland. Mr. Gladstone is the examiner, and Mr. Blake, in answer to his question says,—The question is 1,470.

23385 I am quite aware that that establishes my first proposition, that in 1838 the Board were clear and express on the subject, but what I want to know is why they changed from the clear and express statement which would have been a protection to the children into a very ambiguous statement, under which a different system was brought in, by the Synod of Ulster?—Now, that being granted, no indistinguishable, as to the obligation, in 1838, to exclude, we come to the Board's account of the communion of the Synod of Ulster, in January, 1840, which you will allow me to read. In the whole of the reports, from first to last, up to the time I am now speaking, there is no instance in their entire proceedings, of anything in clearness, or emphasis, or distinctness, like that account of the Presbyterian junction, as a religious body, with the Commissioners, on the *Corbett* case, in January 1840. Mr. Gibson has brought forward what I will call the *weak* application, but it is not the terms of the application we are to discuss, but the Board's decision upon the application, and the Commissioners describing the result of that application say—

23386 What are you reading from?—The Board's 6th Report, for 1850—giving an account of the junction. The application made by the Rev Dr. Stewart, of Drogheda, is set forth in extenso, and the Commissioners say in the text of their own report, paragraph 21.—

"The school, as your Excellency will observe, is conducted by a Committee chosen by the parents of the children, the time for religious instruction is so arranged as not to interfere with the scientific or secular business of the school, no children are required to be present at it whose parents or guardians object to their being so, and such children are permitted to absent themselves whenever their parents or guardians think fit, for the purpose of receiving such religious instruction as they may provide for them. All this, in substance, agrees with the regulations of a school called the Temple Meeting-house School, to which we gave special assistance in 1835, after having explained our views fully in a letter, which has since been published with our Reports."

23387 The Temple Meeting-house letter is then quoted, on the next page. The paragraph bearing on the patron's obligation to exclude is—

"The rule that the hours from two till three of each day, except Saturday, shall be regularly set apart for reading and instruction in the Holy Scriptures, is quite compatible with the regulations of the Commissioners, provided that such children only as are directed by their parents to attend, be then allowed to continue in the school, and that all others do then retire. And with respect to the exercise on Saturday, it also is compatible with their rules, provided that those children only shall attend upon that day whose parents direct that they shall join in reading or receiving instruction in the Holy Scriptures, so that an opportunity be thus afforded for all others to receive such religious instruction of that time, as their parents or guardians shall possibly see fit. As you mention that you occasionally visit the school to mark the progress and administer such instruction as the circumstances and capacity of the children may require, the Commissioners desire us to observe that it is the essence of their rule that religious instruction should be given only at the time specially appointed for that purpose, and that children whose parents do not direct them to be present at it should previously retire."

Can this be read to agree in substance with Dr. Stewart's proposal?—I say you are to take the *Corbett* application as binding the applicants only. But, in the decision of the Commissioners, in this case, they state that they entertain the same views that the Board did, in 1835, in the Temple Meeting-house case, which Mr. Blake explained somewhat more than two years



Dec 3, 1865.

James Wm.  
Hovvynagh,  
sqg.

before, to the House of Commons, that when the Rev. Mr. Love, patron of the Temple Meeting-house school, 1833, and it was perfectly indifferent to him whether the minority went or stayed, it was very material to the Board, and that the children should go, and, therefore, the Board not only told him it was a rule but of the essence of the rules, to exclude religious minorities, and in the face of that emphatic declaration, the Presbyterians joined. This report of 1835, dated April 1840, includes the proceedings of January, 1840. The whole would then show that the Presbyterians and the Board were alike bound, as men of honour, by what is stated in the Sixth Report. If the applicant and the deputation say they did not go in under that rule and declaration, I say they stand before the world as men utterly dishonourable, and that they have broken faith with the Presbyterian body.

23288. Mr. Stokes.—The Presbyterian body?—Yes, sir. It is a purely hypothetical case that I put.

23289. Master Brooke.—Take the converse of that mode of argument. Dr. Stewart writes a letter stating the course of his school, in which time is not a word from beginning to end as to exclusion of children, but merely a permission to depart. Mr. Blake was the writer of the Report for 1830, in which he states the report of that application in the 21st paragraph, giving very faithfully and fairly the substance of Dr. Stewart's application.—"The time is so arranged that no children are required to be present, and such children are permitted to absent themselves." That is a very faithful statement of what the Presbyterians said. Then he goes on to tell, not the Presbyterians, but His Excellency that that is exactly in substance the same as what was laid down in the letter of 1833, so that the Presbyterian body might fairly say, Mr. Blake, instead of binding us by those strong terms of Mr. Kelly's letter of 1833, tells us it is to be considered as meaning no more than what we asked for through Dr. Stewart, patron of the Cornhill school. Mr. Blake is avowing that these two are the same in substance, shaming the peculiar strength of the letter of 1833, and admits that Dr. Stewart's terms will serve the purpose as well. And then follows the next version of the rules published in 1842—and it is so very ingeniously altered that really any person may take no notice or the other sense from it as he pleases; and, therefore, Archbishop Stophard moved on having it determined one way or another, protesting he could not take up his mind upon the ambiguity.—The words "that no child be compelled to receive or be present at religious instruction," you admit, existed in 1843. You admit that there was no change up to 1847 in the words, but that during the year 1847—

23290. I cannot admit that?—I assert that the form of words, "that no child be compelled to receive or be present at," introduced in April, 1843, whatever the meaning of these words was, continued up to 29th January, 1848. In December, 1844, Archbishop Stophard asked for an interpretation of these words. They were open, grammatically, he said, to two meanings, to one of which he would bind himself, and to the other he would not—that is, if the word "compel" governed only the first clause of the sentence, he would agree not to compel anyone to be present. If the word "compel" governed both clauses of the sentence, he would compel no one to receive or to be present at, but if the second clause was absolute, and independent, and not governed by the word "compel"—"compel to receive, as be present at"—if it meant, in fact, that he was to put out the child, he would not submit to it. Now, if the Board had any doubt, whatever, as to the true meaning of the prohibition in 1844 or 1845, it was the simplest thing in the world to tell an intelligent and an able man, son of a Protestant bishop, that the meaning did not involve the obligation to exclude. Instead of that, they sat contumaciously, I may say, at the tail of the discussion, upon Archbishop Stophard. The Established Church Protestants of Ireland refer in the following manner, to this rule.—In May, 1846, less than two months after the Board's refusal to interpret the rule for Archbishop Stophard, so as to withdraw the

patron's obligation to exclude minorities, a petition was presented to Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister, signed by nine Protestant prelates, headed by the Lord Primate, 1,700 clergymen, 31 peers, 1,632 influential landlords, and the petitions of 50,000 persons supported the claim for aid for the Church Education schools. The following passages will suffice to show how tightly and how generally understood was the obligation of patrons to exclude Catholic children from Protestant instruction where the Catholic parent had not assented to the presence of his child.—"That parent has no right to require others to be his instruments in enforcing an unlawful exercise of his authority over his child. They could not recognise such an exertion of parental authority as if it were lawful, and lend their assistance in enforcing it. So that, even if it were voluntarily exerted in forbidding the Bible to be read, our clergy could not consent to lend themselves in giving effect to such an unlawful command. But when they regard the parent as himself in bondage to the usurped authority of the Church of Rome, and as not exercising his own free will, but obeying, as a passive agent, in binding the same yoke upon his children, the duty of refusing to co-operate with him is still clearer. The clergy may be able to do but little towards delivering their Roman Catholic countrymen from such bondage, but they can, at least, keep themselves free from the guilt of becoming instruments in rivetting its chains upon them, and, thus, accordingly, they resolved to do." On the 9th of June the Prime Minister, in an able letter, reiterated the general purport of the rules of the Board, amongst others that "no child be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object," and, regretting the necessity of rejecting their application, declined assenting to the change proposed in this respect. Do you suppose for a moment that a body of men constituted such as the National Board, containing eminent prelates of the Established Church, eminent and loyal Protestants, that they could allow such a body of men to labour under the delusion that these men laboured under? They had only simply to say you are not bound to put out the children; you are only not to compel them to receive or compel them to be present at religious instruction. That was in 1845. How did the meaning of the words change from that, in 1847, when the Board stated, not that the interpretation was retrospective, for the Commissioners never said it was a retrospective meaning, but that nevertheless non-exclusion was to be deemed the true interpretation. Archbishop Stophard in the best exposure of these views, and he published a pamphlet, giving an account of the change, which he succeeded in effecting. Writing about the change at the close of 1847, just after it had been effected, he stated in a letter to the Protestant clergy of the diocese of Meath, written and published with the approbation of the bishop, his father—

"The Board had themselves raised the question" (as to the interpretation of the rule). "They had formerly gone beyond the most objectionable sense of this rule. They had affirmed that it was of the essence of *these rules*. [These initials copied from his own pamphlet.] "That the *patrons* should exclude from religious instruction all who were not actually directed by their parents to remain." [Letter to the Temple Meeting-house School.] "And when a proposition for aid to a school ('the Cornhill' was such a case), it seems corresponding to the reasonable construction of this rule, was put before them, they republished as being unerringly the same, that letter to the Temple Meeting-house School, putting in it *these* the two most objectionable parts."

Against this interpretation Archbishop Stophard says:—

"To us" [the Protestant clergy] "the difference of interpretation is just of *principle* and very great."  
"We cannot carry *into* effect the parents' prohibition. [This we cannot do.] "We cannot undertake to perform" [as wrong as] "for the parent."  
"We had bound to have a child's religious instruction at the hands of his parent, although he asked it. We cannot make the above our own act."

Dec. 5, 1847.

James Wm.  
Kavanaugh,  
esq.

"This was one of the two things we judged essential. Had they then (in 1844) been granted to us, we would have accepted, being refused, we remained separate. Having (in 1847) obtained, we accept them; were they not granted, we should yet remain apart."

Here is the true historical account of it from the man who got the change made in September, 1847.

23391. All that could not bind the Presbyterians in the best, for their arrangements had been made in January, 1840.—It is so clear as light, that as there was no change in the rule, and as they refused for three years to give the interpretation sought by Archbishop Stoyford, that in this account you have the true interpretation of the rule.

23392. I say, then, that the compact between the Presbyterians and the Board took place in the month of January, 1840, that it is stated in two paragraphs of the 6th report of the Commissioners, namely, paragraphs 19 and 20; and paragraph 19 contains, in full, the letter from Dr Stewart, the patron of the Carron school, and states the rule thus, "The times for reading the Holy Scriptures, for catechetical examination, are so arranged as not to interfere with, or impede the scientific or secular business of the school; and no child, whose parents or guardians object, is required to be present, or take part in these exercises; and no obstructions shall be offered to the children of these parents receiving such instruction elsewhere, as they may think proper." Not a word more. That is the Presbyterian proposition. Another paragraph contains the determination of the Board upon it. "It appears to us that the rules of the school for which aid was thus sought, were compatible with the principles of the National system. We, therefore, granted the desired salary of £2 a year, and a stock of books." Not a word of reference to the letter of 1833, but simply on the ground that Dr Stewart's letter is an offer which the Board accepts as being compatible with their principles, there is a closed agreement, under which the *Synod of Ulster* accepts aid from the Board.

How could they be afterwards affected by any interpretation, or discussion which the Board might put forward to other parties? They had got their bargain closed, and Mr Blake, three months afterwards, in April, coming to tell the Lord Lieutenant and the public what had been done. He goes on in paragraph 21, and states that he considers all this, in substance, to agree with the regulations of the Temple Meeting-house School. I cannot see how that could be reconciled with accurate statement. It appears to me to be very unlike the regulations of the Temple Meeting-house School, but that was his allegation. That could not bind the *Synod of Ulster* in the least, nor affect them. They had got their bargain closed, as I understand, and so it continued until 1866.—Will you allow me to reconcile my answer with the statement quoted by you from the report?—It appears to me that the rules of the school, for which aid was thus sought, were compatible with the principles of the National system. I quite agree with the Board, nor is there any conflict or contradiction unless it can be shown that there was something incompatible—which there is not—because the applicant here, as in the Temple Meeting-house case, says that the children are allowed liberty to withdraw. That, surely, is not incompatible with the principles of the Board; but the Board turned round and say to the Presbyterian *Synod*, in 1840, as they said to one of that body before in 1833, the Rev Mr. Love, your application is compatible with the rules of the Board; but, outlying this, a duty devolves on you, in addition to this requirement of compulsion, you are obliged to put out the children. The few words which you have quoted from paragraph 20, are, you will see, Master Brooke, only the brief preamble to the long and detailed statements set forth in paragraphs 21 and 22, comparing the Carron case of 1840 with the Temple Meeting-house case of 1833, the latter or Board's order upon which, drafted by Mr. Blake, who writes the sixth report, is published. Mr. Blake, accounting for it, in answer to Mr. Gladstone, said:

"The minister stated to us what his rule was, and it appeared to be a matter of indifference to him whether the children remained or went away during the time of religious instruction—our rule is that they shall go away, and, in order to prevent the possibility of any mistake we, in my answer to his letter, state distinctly that he may give religious instruction, provided those children only are allowed to be present whose parents shall object them to be so; our object is, in short both with reference to Protestants and Catholics, to prevent troubling the children of one communion into exercises when religious instruction is being given to the other." Again, Mr. Blake said, under further examination:

"1477. You would not be inclined to say that the mere absence of dissent constituted an assent sufficient for the purpose?—I should not consider the absence of dissent as a sufficient justification.

"1478. The absence of dissent may have arisen from ignorance?—Yes, I have heard, for instance, within a few days that in a school in which there is a Roman Catholic master, an attempt was made to teach the Roman Catholic children in the presence of Protestant children; a division has been made to make strict inquiry into it; it did not come to us as a complaint, if that were done I should recommend the men to be dismissed."

Can you produce, in the same amount of words, anything clearer than that?

23393. Will you read what the same Mr. Blake said in 1840?—I want to supplement that evidence, given in 1837, so as to prove continuous identity of views and rule up to 1848. If I take the words "that as child be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction"—whatever the meaning of that clause is; and that these words were never altered until 1848, it is clear, by all the laws of evidence and of interpretation, that when the words remained the same, that whatever interpretation of them was stated by the Commissioners who drafted the rule, and who was the most active member of the Board, must be accepted as the true interpretation until they were altered at the close of 1847.

23394. I think your statement too strong, and you have never yet answered my question. If that be so, how do you account for an alteration of the rules in 1843, the first publication of the rules after the arrangement with the Presbyterians? How do you account for their having changed the rule of 1838, which was a clear rule, comparatively clear at least, into an ambiguous rule, under which the Presbyterian body might have considered they were at liberty to continue their course? Why did they make that which was clear ambiguous, if they had not a purpose in giving the Presbyterian body some sufficient ground for joining the Board on their own terms?—I beg to say that you are under a mistake. I did not say that the rules were not changed, but that the prohibition expressed by the words "that accordingly no child be compelled to receive, or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object," was maintained. I repeat my statement that this rule from December, 1831, to November, 1847, or a period of sixteen years, underwent no change, in the sense of relaxing the obligation to exclude, while this important portion of the words of the rule, the subject matter of our conversation, "that no child be compelled to receive or be present at," never underwent one tittle of alteration, transposition, or change, from April, 1843, to December, 1847. My point is that these words underwent no alteration.

23395. You have not yet told me why the Board—I have no right to ask you, for you are not answerable for the conduct of the Board—but as you stand up as its champion in the particular transaction—I ask you the question why they deserted the plain ground in 1838, and got into ambiguous ground in 1843, which ambiguity actually furnished a plausible and fair ground of argument to the Presbyterian body continuing to act as they got leave to act in the case of the Carron school?—My answer to that is, that the ambiguity was not arising from looseness of style, but not detected till the verbal astuteness of Archbishop Stoyford called attention to the two-fold interpretation to which, from construction, the phrase was open, and when the change of interpretation was demanded by

Dec 8, 1868.

James Wm.  
Kavanaugh,  
sq.

him of the Board, they gave it reluctantly, and after a controversy of three years. It is ingenuously now that there was not a change of rule, but merely of interpretation. The rule of December, 1831, as well as the rule of 1838, stated Presbyterians in the face; and at the very interview with the Lord Lieutenant, in the Castle, January, 1840, Lord Elington, in explicit terms, informs them, "that no children should be required to attend or be present at religious instruction, whose parents or guardians disapproved of their being so." This is identically, though not verbatim, the same as the prohibition in the code of 1843, save the substitution of "compelled" for "required" which you suppose to be a change, namely, "that no child be compelled to receive or be present at," and thus I show that that rule stated the Presbyterians in the face when they joined in January, 1840, with that rule, continuing in 1843-44-45-46-47, without the slightest modification, transposition, or alteration, and therefore that there was no change of rule or even change of interpretation made for them, but I do not leave any way the Presbyterians understood, or alleged they understood by it, for that is entirely a domestic question for themselves, into which it would be improper for me to enter.

23396. Mr. Stokes.—Are you aware that it has been stated on competent evidence that the members of the National Board were not agreed amongst themselves about the interpretation of the rule? I never heard that there was any doubt, in official circles, as to the rule between 1840 and 1847. I was Head Master of the model schools 1841-1844, Inspector in 1844-6, and Head Inspector in 1847; and the simple fact is, that I would have felt it my bounden duty, during that time and during the whole period from 1831, to protect the minority, by requiring the parents to exclude the child, unless the express assent of the parent was given for the child to be present.

23397. Did you ever read the evidence given by Dr. Henry on that point?—I have read all the evidence given in both houses of Parliament on the subject since the Board was founded.

23398. Do you not remember his stating that the rule was ambiguous, and was variously interpreted by members of the Board?—I read that, but the evidence of Mr. McCleery is of ten thousand times more value. He was Inspector and Head Inspector in Ulster—from the north of Ireland himself—a man of acute mind, and well acquainted with the working of the system, from 1831.

23399. Master Brooke.—In forming your opinion about the compact with the Presbyterians, have you taken into consideration the statement in that same 4th report in which is stated what the Lord Lieutenant stated to the deputation of the Synod on the 7th of January, when such members of the Board as were able attended—"that the National schools must be open to children of all religious denominations, nevertheless, that the patrons of each might have such religious instruction given as it during school hours as they thought proper, provided such an arrangement was made as that the instruction so given should not interfere with or impede the literary business of the school, and that no children should be required to attend, or be present at it whose parents or guardians disapproved of their being so?"—It supports my statement, for I had the very words of the rule inserted into the summary answer of the Lord Lieutenant, "that no children should be required to attend or be present at it whose parents or guardians disapproved of their being so." Is only strengthening the case made by me. I beg to inform you who the Commissioners present were—Archbishop Whately, Mr. Blake, and Rev. Dr. Henry, the two former had been on the Board from its formation, while Dr. Henry had been only a year a Commissioner. It was Mr. Blake that inspired Lord Elington's answer to the deputation from the Synod, and we are to interpret the statements in it in the light of his whole action and evidence on the subject.

23400. "These explanations," the report says,

"were deemed so far satisfactory, and it was arranged that an application should be made to the Board for aid towards some one school, the actual circumstances and rules of which should be stated—that the Board should come to a decision upon it without waiting to the particular case for any previous reference to their Local Superintendent, and that whatever was done by the Board on it should be done also upon every other similarly circumstanced." This language of the Lord Lieutenant there is in the very words of the rule afterwards adopted in 1843. Now, we have the Presbyterians construed it. The arrangement was that an application should be made to the Board. Upon that understanding there comes the letter of Dr. Stewart, which adopts their own interpretation of that ambiguity, and states it without the least ambiguity. It states as plainly as possible their interpretation of the matter in the way I have already mentioned, and that was deemed satisfactory by the Board. The Presbyterians having an ambiguous rule proposed to them, adopted their own interpretation, stated that interpretation, and that interpretation of theirs so stated without ambiguity was held according to the 20th paragraph of the report to be satisfactory.—In reply, I repeat that the words of the rule are included in one of the three or four statements made by the Lord Lieutenant under the advice of Archbishop Whately, Mr. Blake, and the Rev. Dr. Henry, the three Commissioners present at the interview—and those three only. And if there could be any doubt as to the meaning, it is set clear in the report written two months afterwards by Mr. Blake. The proof I give you that Mr. Blake wrote it is the evidence of Mr. Macdonnell before the Lords' Committee in 1854, he states that Mr. Blake wrote it. They had the rule of 1831 and of 1838 before them. The Lord Lieutenant quoted and applied the rule, which differs in no particular (except that the word "compelled" is put for its equivalent "required") from the rule of 1843, the words of which never underwent the slightest change, transposition, or modification until the close of 1847. I read the following passage from the *Redeemman* (weekly Month) published under Archbishop Stephen, 20th December, 1844:—"The rule which ought to stand in the place of the clause to which I object is paragraph 3 section 2 of the copy of the rules you"—meaning the Inspector, Mr. Coyle—"presented to me. The trust deed, considered as a legal document, ought to be free from all ambiguity, the meaning ought to be put beyond question." There is a sentence in the rule above referred to, which does not seem sufficiently definite for a legal document. The sentence to which I allude is as follows:—"That no child be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object." Thus, as I understand it, might mean either that no child be compelled to receive or be compelled to be present at, or it might mean that no child be compelled to receive or be present at, and so forth. There is an important difference between the two constructions of the sentence. I would bind myself to the former. I would not bind myself to the latter. I do not know to which construction I should be legally bound, if the rule were inserted in the deed, as it now stands. I would not, therefore, undertake to sign such a deed, unless the construction of that sentence were so altered as to put its meaning beyond all possibility of doubt." This application for aid to Redeemman school, now Navan, is dated 20th December, 1844, or nearly five years after the Presbyterian junction. Now, so far from the Board awaiting to the interpretation he desired to put upon it, what do they say? At a meeting of the Board, the following being the members present, the case was decided—Archbishop Whately, Rev. Dr. Sadler, the Marquess of Kildare, Baron Greene, the Rev. Dr. Henry, and Mr. Macdonnell, the Resident Commissioner, the only Catholic Commissioner present being his Grace Archbishop Murray. The final decision of the Board on that application, may be understood from the following extracts from the letter addressed to the Venerable Archbishop Stephen:—

Dec. 8, 1885.

James Wm.  
Ramsay,  
Esq."Education Office,  
15th March, 1886.

"Sir,—Your letter affords ground, in one part of it, for inference, or at least for suspicion, that it would be, in your opinion, not altogether unprofitable for a person to receive a grant from the Board, while concealing his objection to some of the rules, and disagreeing, afterwards, to disavow them in practice.

"The Commissioners, therefore, feel that they can anticipate no cordial and closest co-operation from you, in the management of any National school, but rather mutual distrust, mutual despondency, and, perhaps, troublesome litigation, and this feeling is strengthened by the circumstance of your having openly, in a pamphlet, exposed to the Commissioners conduct the most detestable and base.

"No confidence, whatever, can reasonably be felt in the persons on whom such imputations are deservedly cast, or in the author of such imputations, if they are groundless. On such supposition, therefore, it is most undesirable that persons so disqualified should have any dealings together.

"The Commissioners accordingly direct us to say to you that you wish to have a National school established for the benefit of your tenantry, the application must be made, and the whole management of it conducted by some other persons, between whom and the Commissioners the requisite degree of mutual confidence and sincere co-operation may be reasonably hoped for.

"(Signed),

"MARTIN CROSS,  
"JAMES KELLY."

23401 Mr. Sullivan.—Now, will you read from the evidence given by Archbishop Stoford before the Local Committee in 1854, on National Education in Ireland—read from 4538.—Yes. I see that Viscount Halifax (Earl of Devonshire) is the chairman.—

"Will you have the goodness to state what were the grounds of your objection, and how they were removed previously to your joining the Board?" Answer.—"The objection in point of principle, which I had was to the rule, which appeared to me to require that the patron of a school should be made the instrument of a parent in removing his children from religious instruction. I was ready to assent to the principle that I would not compel a child to receive, but I would leave it to the parent to withdraw his own child, but I could not bind myself in any way to remove the child as the parent might direct me. I could not be the instrument of the parent for removing out his will, where I thought it was wrong. It appeared to me that the rule of the Board did involve such an obligation: it was capable of such construction, and the Board declined to say which construction was the right one, and until they should do so, I could not put my school into connexion with them. That was the main objection which I had, in point of principle. Then there was another in point of expediency, it appeared to me that the non-voted system, with which alone I was willing to connect myself, was not intended to be permanent, and, without some security for its permanence, I was not willing to connect myself with it. There was the two chief points which prevented me, for some time, from entering my schools with the Board. 4539. Previously to putting your schools under the Board, did you receive from them any satisfactory explanations?—I did, upon the lapse of about a year and a half. At first, they declined to give me any explanation, but after the lapse of about a year and a half they gave me satisfactory explanations on both those points. 4540. [Lord Rosemary.] That is to say, in the first case, they stated that it was not obligatory upon you to force a child out, merely because you knew that his parent objected to its remaining during the time of religious instruction?—Yes. 4541. So that it does devolve upon the parent himself to withdraw his child, and he could not claim from you the right of your letting the child to leave the school for him?—Yes, that was the explanation given. 4542. You felt that to be perfectly satisfactory, upon the first point?—Yes. 4543. With regard to the second point, had you an assurance that the non-voted system was to continue?—I had. 4544. [Earl of Devon.] Do not you think that some of the clergy of the Established Church are labouring under a similar apprehension to that which you yourself laboured under, previously to your giving your assent to the Board?—I do not consider that I laboured under any misapprehension. 4545. You put a different interpretation upon the rule to that which was given by the Board?—No, the rule was altered to meet my views."

23402. Do you not think what you have just read fully bears out the statement that Archbishop Stoford was under the impression the rule had been changed?—Yes, in the clearest manner.

23403. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You have quoted the words of Archbishop Stoford—"the rule was altered to meet my views." Now, should you regard his opinion or the opinion of the Commissioners themselves as preferable on that point?—The Commissioners consider themselves, as a body.

23404. You regard them as men of honour and men of truth?—Yes, and Archbishop Stoford also.

23405. Now, when the question was raised by Archbishop Stoford, did the Commissioners say that the rule implied exclusion by the managers, or that that idea was a mistake, or anything to that effect?—No.

23406. Do they say the wording is even doubtful or capable of two interpretations, and "we will make it plain"?—No.

23407. Do they not seem to be surprised that it should be supposed to be capable of two interpretations?—Yes; I always understood that the Board attacked but one interpretation to it.

23408. What is that interpretation?—That the patron must not compel the child to receive religious instruction;—nay, more, that he must consent of the child to be absent therefrom, unless there was express assent on the part of the parent.

23409. Will you read from the 15th Report of the National Education Commissioners, the Report for the year 1849, as to the explanation of the rule respecting religious instruction, sec. xli.—71, page 30.—I have read it. It is inserted twice in my evidence, upon two distinct occasions, already.

23410. Will you read it now?—I will, but I felt bound to inform the Commissioners of the fact of the repetition:—

"Explanation of rule as to religious instruction. We have recently issued an important order on the subject of religious instruction, to which we beg to draw your Excellency's attention. In our report for 1847, we stated that our Secretaries having informed us that they had frequently been consulted, both personally and by letter, as to the true meaning of the following portion of section two, paragraph three, of the rules of the Board, with reference to religious instruction: "That due regard be had to parental right and authority; that accordingly, no child be compelled to receive or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object," and that they deemed it desirable that we should supply them with an authoritative answer to such questions. We directed that, by a minute, bearing date, 18th of November, 1847, to give the following explanation in reply to all such inquiries, in force:—

23411. Read the first and second paragraphs following:—

"First, that the true interpretation of the words in question clearly is, that no child be compelled to receive or to be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object, and that this rule is in accordance with the justification in the school-room, of the arrangements for giving religious instruction, as required by rule one, section two, has hitherto been found amply sufficient for the full enforcement of parental authority. Secondly, that though all that is required by this rule (section two, paragraph three) is, that the parent should engage not to compel any child to be present at any religious instruction; yet, should the parent on any point either directly or indirectly, to induce any child to attend such religious instruction, contrary to the desire of his parents or guardians, the Commissioners would consider such conduct inconsistent with the whole spirit of their system."

23412. Did not the Commissioners of National Education in that year in connection with "the Stoford rule," as it has been called—did they not say the true interpretation of the words clearly is, that no child be compelled to be present at?—Yes, but the same persons who so stated, allowed Archbishop Stoford to resist under the definition, if he laboured under one, in the correspondence extending over the years 1844, 1845, '47. And to the close of 1857, allowed that important body, the Established Church of Ireland, nearly all their parishes, their clergy, their territorial magnates, and 60,000 of the laity to labour under a similar delusion. I leave you to come to whatever conclusion you like respecting the conduct of the Com-

Dec 8, 1866.

James Wm. Keenan, Esq.

members of National Education, if you believe that they did do so.

23413. The Commissioners themselves having said the true interpretation clearly is, "that no child be compelled to be present at," and having also said their rule has hitherto been found amply sufficient, is it not clear their interpretation of the rule has been always uniform?—Excuse me; no words can be clearer than these—"In reply to all such inquiries as *before*." Had the meaning of eleven simple words, "that no child be compelled to receive or be present at"—changed during the period of controversy—had their import changed within the three years in question?

23414. Was not the design of that interpretation to remove misconception from the mind of Archbishop Stedden and similar parties?—Quoting the Royal Commission of 1813, the object was to facilitate, protect, and promote that very proselytizing—and that, in the very middle of the furnace—for it was in 1847—even the suspension of which Lord Stanley intended should be banished from the schools.

23415. Is not the object of the Board, which I state, implied when they say in connection with the true interpretation of the rule that the rule has hitherto been amply sufficient for the purpose?—I have answered it fully. The meaning of a few simple words had not changed in the years in question, and then the Commission, with the Archbishop of Dublin at its head, and numbering amongst its members the most eminent men, allowed these conscientious Protestants to be banished for such a number of years, under misapprehension, and thereby deluded them from giving in themselves to the Board, namely, that is what no one will believe.

23416. Are you not aware that the Rev. Dr. Henry, in his evidence in 1854, in answer to query 2677, says—"At the time the Presbyterians presented their Commission the principle was clearly recognised by the adoption of that case," "that the patron has the liberty of giving religious instruction to all who will accept it, that it is perfectly non-compulsory; there is no compulsion to be used, either to induce children to attend, or to compel them to retire?"—The answer to this is to be found in the text of the Board's report, within less than three months of the admission of the Presbyterians, setting forth that it was of the essence of the rules to exclude these children.

23417. When did Mr. Blake come to be a Commissioner of Education?—At his death; 9th January, 1849. I am obliged to you for reminding me to state that he was not in Ireland when the change was effected, having resided in England for three or four years before his death.

23418. Are you not aware the Rev. Dr. Henry testified for his colleagues, and in their absence, for the Archbishop of Dublin, Mr. Blake and others, that they always declared that was the meaning of the rule—non-exclusion?—The answer to that is to be found in the emphasis, clear, and distinct statement of Mr. Blake himself, in reply to Mr. Gladstone, in the statement of the Rev. Dr. Currie himself, paid Commissioner, a member of your own body and of the Synod of Ulster, and in that of Dr. now Judge Kelly, secretary, in their evidence before Parliament. For the Rev. Dr. Henry I have the highest personal respect, but what could he know about the rules and regulations? If you oblige me to tell you I will give my reasons.

23419. With regard to the use of the word "directed" on page 147, vol. 1—"Provided that such children only as are directed by their parents to attend, be allowed to continue in the school, and that all others do then retire." Does the word "directed" imply more than the significance on the part of the parents, of their sanction that their children should attend?—The evidence of Mr. Blake is clear on that point.

23420. I wish for your own interpretation?—My own interpretation is, that they were obliged to get the children out—to turn them out—"that all others do, previously, retire."

23421. Does the word "directed," in your opinion, involve more than a signification of assent on the part of the parents that the child should remain?—No. If such direction or approval be not given, the patron must put the children out, for the dissent is implied, and the assent must be given, actively.

23422. Must it not, as part of the same history, be explained by Dr. Stewart's application, to which it refers?—Dr. Stewart's application, namely, could not bind the Board. It is, as the stark report says, "the decision the Board should come to, on it," that we must look to for the special law of the case. Another source of misapprehension or fallacy is the opening statement in the Report, that "the rules of the Commission applied most wisely compatible with the principles of the National system"; that is, he engaged not to compel, but the system required that, and more. He said it was immaterial to him, as Mr. Love had said before, whether the children went or stayed. But the Board told Dr. Stewart, of Broomfield, in the Carson case, in January, 1840, what they told Mr. Love, in the Temple Meeting-house case, in July, 1833, that it was "of the essence of the rules that they should previously, retire."

23423. The Chairman.—Can you show the Commissioners the answer to the Rev. Dr. Stewart, in which the Commissioners of National Education say that certain things are of the essence of the rule?—If your lordship will be kind enough to look to the Report for 1839, the sixth report, in which the history of the Presbyterian question is given, though it occurred in 1840, if you will look to paragraphs 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, you will find the history of the case in those paragraphs, the Temple Meeting-house letter, in which, that statement indicated, occurs, included.

23424. Can you show to the Commissioners the answer to the Rev. Mr. Stewart, in which the Commissioners of National Education say that certain things are of the essence of the rule?—I have not the answer, but the report clearly implies that this letter was read or sent to him. Your lordship's question is a very important one. If this letter in the report was not sent as a direct personal reply, or what was equivalent to it, to Dr. Stewart, it is only a public document and not a personal one with regard to the case. There is one mistake made, you will see at once, and which has led to a good deal of confusion—application by a party for aid cannot bind the Commissioners. An applicant states, I will conform to so and so, all of which are required by the rules; but there may be other things besides. You are to look to the Board's Order making the grant, and which includes all the conditions. The terms of the application cannot bind, it is the Board's order, depending upon the application, that binds both parties.

23425. What would the Board's order, according to the application, say to Mr. Stewart, as to certain things being of the essence?—It would appear from these paragraphs, to which I refer, that they must have said to him, in sending him a copy of Mr. Secretary Kelly's letter, of the 25th of July, 1833, which they reproduce here, as they said to the Rev. Mr. Love, in 1833: "it appears to be immaterial to you whether the children remain or go; but, from the first, it has ever been of the very essence of our rules that they shall, previously, retire, bringing out into bold relief, by emphatic marking, the Patron's obligation in the several passages of the letter.

23426. You mean they sent him a copy of the Temple Meeting-house letter?—I am loath to assume that.

23427. Are you in a position to state as a fact, that they did send him a copy of the "Temple Meeting-house letter"?—I am not, and it is an important question you raise, but it is implied there, signed by the thirteen members of the Board.

23428. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Must not the term "directed" as part of the same history be explained by Dr. Stewart's application, in which he says, "that no child whose parents or guardians object is required to be present"?—No child, from the beginning, could be required to be present, whether his parents objected or

Dec 9, 1864.  
James Wm  
Kearney,  
esq.

not. All parties agreed, that if they sought aid, no one was to be compelled to attend religious instruction.

23429. ANSWER the question—I have answered it, to the best of my power.

23430. I repeat the question. Must not the term "directed," as part of the same history, be explained by Dr Stewart's application, in which he says "that no child whose parents or guardians object is required to be present?"—My answer is that the expressions, "assent," "allow," "dissent," and "not forced," "not to compel," and so on, were altered, from time to time.

23431. Then, will you not undertake to answer the question I have put?—I think I have answered it. Will you be kind enough to repeat it.

23432. [Question repeated].—They are totally different, in meaning, "directed to attend," and "whose parents object."

23433. Do you regard that as an answer to my question?—I do, that the two are totally different.

23434. Must not the same term "directed," as part of the same history, also be explained by the statement of the Commissioners in paragraph 51, where they say, "No children are required to be present at it whose parents or guardians object to their being so, and such children are permitted to absent themselves, whenever their parents or guardians think fit, for the purpose of receiving such religious instruction as they may provide for them?"—There is a wide difference in meaning between the two expressions. There is a radical change made—the difference between directing them to be present and not objecting to their being present. The two things are quite different, as explained by Mr Blake.

23435. Do you regard that as a categorical answer to my question?—Most certainly.

23436. The Chairman.—Did I understand you rightly on a former day to say that the object of the rule as to religious instruction was to give the child the same security that the Poor Law Act gave him?—Yes, my lord, was, or ought to be the object. The ratepayer's child in a state-aided school ought to have his faith as well protected from assault as that of the pauper child in the workhouse.

23437. Will you look to the 49th section of the Poor Law Act?—I do so.

23438. "That no order of the Commissioners nor any bye law shall oblige any inmate of any workhouse to attend at or be present at any religious service which may be celebrated in a mode contrary to the religious principles of such inmate." Would it not be necessary, in construing that sentence, to read it as meaning that no order shall oblige any inmate to be present at?—It would.

23439. Can you put any other interpretation on these words?—None.

23440. Do you observe, my lord, that the subject matter there is attending religious service, and do you see as you go down lower, when it comes to religious instruction—"Nor shall authorize the education of any child in such workhouse in any religious creed other than that professed by the parents or surviving parent of such child?"—Do you see how emphatic it is, when it comes to religious instruction? There are no equivocal clauses or doubts—"receive or be present at" are altogether excluded, and the words are absolute and unqualified—"Nor shall authorize the education of any child." One is Divine worship and the other is religious education.

23441. Should you say that the education of a child in an antagonistic creed was being carried on by the simple fact of its being allowed to remain in the room while other children were being taught it?—If within hearing of the instruction. The act expressly enforces it—"Nor shall authorize the education of any child," and so on.

23442. Will you look at the words of the rule of 1845?—I do so.

23443. "That no child be compelled to receive or be present at religious instruction." If that rule were framed by a person who had before him the clause in

the Poor Law Act, or if it were laid alongside the words in the Poor Law for the purpose of comparison, would not such comparison lead to the conclusion that it also was to be read in the sense of compelled to be present at?—It might, by uneducated persons, but the grammatical construction in both, in the Rule and in the Poor Law Act, is not analogous. There is a difference, for Archbishop Stedward said that the Rule was open to other construction, but it is important to know that this rule was framed and those words set forth before the passing of the Poor Law Act, which was not enacted until late in 1838, and that may alter your view of the question.

23444. The first place where I see that rule printed is in the report for the year 1842?—But, my lord, the distinction conveyed by those words occurs earlier. The distinction between "receive" and "be present at," and "attend" and "be present at," is as old as the Temple Meeting-house letter, 1833, and is set forth in the text of the Board's report for 1837, as a consequence of the change of rule then made for Presbyterians. Those words that you have referred to occur earlier, you will find that the Lord Advocate included these words—"be required to attend or be present at"—in January, 1840, addressing the Presbyterians; but the words, "that no child be compelled to receive or be present at," in that precise verbal form, did not occur, in point of fact, before the passing of the Poor Law. The terms of the Poor Law Act are much more satisfactory, and I beg to say that in the discussion, 1860, with regard to the new rule, the returns of the National Board show that they leave out "compelled" and insert "receive," just as in the Poor Law Act. When they were altering that new rule in 1866 Lord Kildare proposed to retain the word "compelled," but, on amendment, by Judge O'Hagan and Lord Granville Buxley, the word "compelled" was left out and "receive" put in, as in the Poor Law, thus supporting your lordship's view, the words were loose as compared with the Poor Law Act, "that nothing shall authorise the instruction of a child."

23445. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware that there were protests from several of the Commissioners declaring that there was a thorough alteration of the rule as to religious instruction in 1866?—A thorough alteration of the Rule of 1847, and I have already given in the names of the three Presbyterians Commissioners who protested against it. I fully agree with you that it was a fundamental alteration—that is the altered rule of 1847, was restored, to a great extent, to what it was originally.

23446. The Chairman.—To which clause of the Poor Law Act do you refer when you say it was altered to make it conformable to the Poor Law Act?—The 49th section. Those rules, you will see, ought to have been far clearer. I admit, with your lordship, that the grammatical construction was doubtful, and should not occur in so important a document, and it would appear that the Commissioners are now of the same opinion, for, in the discussion at the passing of the new rule of 1866, or rather the restoration of the old rule that submitted from the beginning up to 1847, when the Marquis of Kildare proposed to retain the expression "compelled to receive or be present at," an amendment was proposed and carried that instead of "no child shall be compelled to receive," &c., that the words "no child shall receive" be substituted.

23447. On the 28th of November, in answer to Mr. Sullivan, question 19343, you say "private instructions were sent by the then Government, through Lord Granville, the chairman of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, and one of these instructions was to make such a creed return." What do you mean by the term private instructions, and how were they sent through Lord Granville?—Earl Granville was chairman of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, on National Education, in 1854. At the conclusion of that inquiry several draft reports were submitted to the Committee, amongst others, one by Lord Granville, one by Lord Montagu, one by Right Rev. Dr. O'Hagan, Bishop of Coney, and one, I

balices, by either Lord Clancarty or Lord Donoughmore. The committee did not agree on a report, but those draft reports nevertheless appeared. Lord Clancarty being a leading member of the three. Aberdeen Administration had communications with the Irish Government here on the subject, founded on which a letter was sent through General Larcom, the Under Secretary, which letter you will find here in relation that you have ordered, from the National Board. I will quote the date of the letter—Minutes of the Board, September 26, 1834—"The Secretary lays before the Commissioners the suggestions forwarded for their consideration by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, in a letter of the 2nd September, from the Under Secretary, amongst which are the following." Then the different changes of rule suggested, some twenty of these, are there given. The Commissioners then set about recasting the whole code at the close of 1834, and early in 1835, when very serious changes were made.

23443 Read the words relating to creed registration.—They are not here. It is not stated in terms, but it was an instruction conveyed to me from the Board. The Commissioners then took up the code and recast it, which occupied a considerable time. "Ordered further, that copies of the old and of the revised rules, with an explanation as to the nature and extent of the alterations and additions made therein, be forwarded, confidentially, to Earl Grosvenore, Earl St. Germans, Lord Montagu, and the Marquess of Lansdowne, and that they be also furnished with a copy of the suggestions by the Government, arising out of the parliamentary inquiry of 1834, and with a memorandum showing how each case has been disposed of." And in connection with this, I have to state to you that I received verbal instructions from the Board, through Mr. McCreedy, then my colleague in the Education Office, to draw up account-books, clear and simple forms of account-books, rolls, daily report, and register, and in which instructions it was set forth, for the first time, that we were to introduce a creed-register. Under these circumstances, I drew up the school registers which you have already had in evidence.

23444 Mr. Sullivan.—On a former occasion I asked you with respect to the rule as to religious instruction in vested and non-vested schools, and I think you stated that there was no such distinction made in the early days of the Board. Am I right in that?—Yes, up to 1840 there was no such distinction, and as such distinction was made in the Rules until 1843, (set down as for 1842) when it was first distinctly stated in the Board's rule the distinction between vested and non-vested schools.

23445 Will you read from the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, that sat in 1837 on a "Plan of Education (Ireland)," an extract from the evidence of the Rev James Carleton, in reference to convent schools, question 386, put by Mr. Gladstone?—Yes, the Rev Mr. Carleton, a Presbyterian, was the paid or Resident Commissioner of National Education, from 1831 to 1835. I read—

"Mr. Gladstone.—In the visits you paid to schools under the superintendence of Roman Catholic religious bodies did you observe anything in the appearance, or conduct of the schools, or the conduct of the teachers, likely to discourage Protestant children from attending?—The sons have a peculiar dress. It will be seen, at once, they are of a Roman Catholic order. Some of the monks have a peculiar dress, but I am not aware that it is anything approaching to a clerical dress. Others are clothed without any peculiarity. 290. Do you consider that a circumstance not conducive to the attendance of Protestant children?—Entirely. I should think 291. Should you yourself feel any objection to making a grant for a proposed new school of that description?—I do not know that I should while, at the same time, I do not regard these schools as so thoroughly and perfectly adapted to the National system as other schools totally unconnected with any particular religious body. 292. Do you think that though possibly, you might consider it right to enter into connection with those who do not want, with a view to prevent their being rendered more exclusive than they naturally are, still it would not be desirable to encourage the formation of new ones?—I should not like to see them spread, in connection with the National Board

293. Do you think that, in any case, a religious body, having a school in connection with the Board, would be disposed to afford the use of their school-house for the purpose of separate religious instruction to Protestant pupils?—They are bound to do so by the rules, and they must come under an engagement to do so, if required. 294. Do you mean where the school was part of the territory itself?—We require an engagement to that effect, in all cases, without exception. 295. Therefore, supposing a Protestant clergyman, willing to give religious instruction to the Protestant children who might be in attendance in the school, should require the use of the school, at a particular time, for the purpose of giving Protestant instruction, you consider the religious body would be bound to afford the use of the room?—They would be bound to do so, or we should strike off the school."

23451 The Rev. Mr. Carleton was one of the original members of the Board?—He was connected with the Board from its formation until some time in the year 1838.

23452 Did he not fulfil the same functions as the Resident Commissioner does now?—Those functions, and a great many more. Besides Paul Cavanaugh, he was compiler and editor of most of the books. After he ceased to be Paul Commissioner, he was head of the Normal Institution, or Professor of Education.

23453 He was fully cognizant, therefore, of the principles upon which they acted in regard to religious instruction?—Principles and rules, and his evidence on that examination was not merely founded on the rules and regulations, but also on the very fact of a town he had just made inspecting schools in Ireland, monasteries included, immediately previous to his examination.

23454 What inference do you draw from his evidence, with regard to the question as to any difference in the rule that existed between the vested schools and non-vested schools prior to 1840?—No new inference, but one I have been acquainted with since first I was connected with the Board—that, from 1831, it was obligatory on the patrons of schools, vested and non-vested equally, to afford a convenient time and place, in the room, for the separate religious instruction of all children, of whatsoever denomination, frequenting the school.

23455 After the rule was changed to meet the case proposed by Archbishop Stophard, did the Board ever acknowledge that any evil result followed from that change of rule?—It is not for Archbishop Stophard, but for the Presbyterians that that change was made, the Board never acknowledge that any evil follows from their subversion of any portion of the system. Lord Derby, himself, was however one of the firmest and clearest in acknowledging, in a remarkable speech made, in 1838, in the House of Lords, that evil, when he said, "I, for one, regret that on the representation of some parties, that what was secured under the original rule, namely, opportunities for giving religious instruction to minorities, has been withdrawn, and that, in point of fact, in the largest number of schools, but one religious denomination can receive religious instruction."

23456 After the O'Reilly returns were published, did not that passage, which I shall ask you to read, show that the members of the Board themselves admitted that the change had been productive of ill consequences?—I will first read. The Lord Chancellor suggests at a meeting of the Board, 15th May, 1860, that the resolution proposed by the Marquess of Eglinton, namely, the new rule of 1860, should be introduced by the following words: "It appearing from a return furnished to the House of Commons that a large number of children are in the habit of attending religious instruction given by teachers of a creed different from that of the children themselves, the Commissioners, under these circumstances, have felt themselves called upon to reconsider their rules regarding religious instruction." The return referred to here is the O'Reilly return, which I asked Major O'Reilly to move for, in reply to the unfounded statement of the Board—that there was no proselytizing going on in their schools—and here is an admission, by themselves, that the O'Reilly returns prove what I stated.

Dec 9, 1868  
James Wm  
Kearney,  
290

Dec. 3, 1868.

James Wm.  
Kilgallen,  
Esq.

23457 Subsequent to that meeting did the Board make any proposal with regard to the new rule?—The new rule was proposed by the Marquess of Kildare, in terms that you will see in the document before you. An amendment was proposed, merely as a preamble, in the terms I have read to you, by the Lord Chancellor, and an honest and frank preamble it is, to that new rule. The rule was subsequently modified, in the way that I have pointed out, altering the words "be compelled to receive" for "receive;" as referred to in the chairman's remark a while ago; and the rule was then passed, 15th May, 1866, to try and correct the evil working of the old "Notice-system," in the terms of the rule, as it is in the Code of 1856. Three of the members of the Board having objected to the passing of that rule, namely, the three Presbyterian gentlemen, Rev. Dr. Henry, Rev. Dr. Hall, and Mr. Gilson, and a deputation, from the General Assembly, having waited upon Lord Wodehouse, now Earl of Kimberley, representing against the new rule, Lord Kimberley wrote to the Board suggesting that a proviso should be added, such as that suggested by the deputation that waited upon him.

23458. Will you read the minute from the Board referring to that?—Minute of the Board, June 12, 1866. Read letter, No. 5165, year 1866, from the Right Hon. C. P. Fortescue, Chief Secretary for Ireland, stating that the Lord Lieutenant would be prepared to sanction the change of rule regarding religious instruction, as conveyed in the Secretary's letter, May 23, if a proviso in *very much* form as follows be appended to the new rule: "Provided, however, that in case any parent or guardian shall express his desire that his child shall receive any particular religious instruction, and shall send such down in a book to be provided in the school, when necessary, for that purpose, this prohibition shall not apply. The entry in the book shall be signed with the name or mark of the parent or guardian, and the book shall be submitted to the Inspector, so often as he visits the school." Read letter, 5448, year 1866, from the Rev. Dr. Henry, expressing his opinion that the above proviso will have a beneficial effect, and that it should be adopted by the Board. Ordered, that the words of the proviso submitted by the Chief Secretary be approved, inserting after the word 'apply,' seventh line, the following words, 'to the time during which such religious instruction only is given, and that the notice of such expression of desire may, at any time, be revoked by the parent or guardian, and shall, then upon, become operative.' Ordered further, that the Lord Lieutenant be informed that the Commissioners have passed the following resolution, in connection with the question under consideration:—"That, whereas the rule adopted by the Board appears to the Commissioners to furnish the most efficient means of guarding from the suspicion of proselytism the system of separate religious and combined secular instruction, the Commissioners, except in deference to the wishes of the Lord Lieutenant, the proviso suggested in the Chief Secretary's letter, in the hope that it will not interfere with the practical operation of the rule. The Commissioners, however, will feel it to be their duty to propose a repeal of the proviso, if the rule, so modified, should prove, in any manner, inadequate for the accomplishment of its object." Minute, 2nd July, 1866. Read letter, No. 5598, year 1866, from the Right Hon. C. P. Fortescue, Chief Secretary for Ireland, conveying the Lord Lieutenant's approval of the new rule in regard to religious instruction, with the proviso as suggested by His Excellency, and the addition suggested by the Commissioners.

23459. Do you think that that statement or proviso is judicious?—No, I believe that it has the effect, as proved by the evidence I have given as to my recent tour in the north of Ireland, and in some schools in Dublin, of completely frustrating the intended action of the rule.

23460. Do you think the Board were wise, therefore, in passing the resolution?—Very wise, looking to the experience they had of the Notice System in the North of Ireland.

23461. Previous to 1860 what was the rule with re-

gard to applications whether for the building of schools, or for aid for their support, as to the persons making the application?—It is not a rule but a suggestion, a strong recommendation contained in Lord Stanley's letter, recommending the Commissioners to look with particular favour on applicants for aid to either class of schools, namely vested or non vested, where the application proceeds from clergymen of both denominations, Protestants and Catholics, clergymen of one denomination and laymen of another, or laymen of both, and the Commissioners, up to 1860, did act on the recommendation, and even published, from time to time, an analysis of the applications, showing the numbers of them that were signed by applicants under each of these three different categories.

23462. That is, the suggestion became by practice a rule?—A rule that a decided preference was given, and in the original regulations of the Commissioners that were framed within the first month of the existence of the Board, December, 1851, I think you will find it is there adopted as a rule. If you will allow me, I will read it. It comes under No. 7 of the original regulations that were framed so early as the 13th Dec., 1851. It was a sort of provisional Code, consisting of seven rules.

23463. Will you be good enough to read it?—As one of the main objects of His Majesty's Government is to unite, in one system, children of different creeds, and as much must depend on the co-operation of the resident clergy, the Board will look with positive favour upon applications proceeding either from, 1st, Protestant clergymen and Roman Catholic clergymen, conjointly; 2ndly, a clergyman of the one denomination, and a certain number of laymen of the other; 3rdly, of laymen of both denominations.

23464. The Chairman.—Are you aware of any instances of an application from a member of a single creed having been postponed because any available funds were absorbed by joint applications?—I do not recollect any instance of the sort; but all through the earlier period of the proceedings of the Board, the Commissioners state what I am telling you. The preference was proposed up to 1853, and then given up, in deference to Presbyterian opposition.

23465. But you cannot state any case in which that rule was put into operation?—I cannot.

23466. If that be so, do you consider that that rule, as long as it existed, was a practical bar to Presbyterian applications?—They felt that it was, for Mr. Gladstone examined Dr. Cooke at that very point, upon which I have already given evidence. It was asked whether it was an objection they had to connect themselves in applications, with other Protestants, such as of the Established Church, or only with Roman Catholics. Dr. Cooke and several others distinctly stated that the objection was to connect themselves with Roman Catholics, and further, that the State had no more right to ask him or the Presbyterian body to connect the parents of the Church of Rome, as to what they were to do with their schools, than the Bishop of Saxeony had, when he asked Luther, who had intimated that he was about to become a Protestant, whether he had renounced Cardinal Cajetan.

23467. Mr. Seddon.—Will you read from the report of the select Committee of the House of Lords on National Education, Ireland, 1854.—Mr. Cross being the witness and the Earl of Derby being the examiner?—Question 117, the Earl of Derby asks—

"That rule for the purpose of encouraging combination of different religious denominations establishing schools?—Yes. Are you of opinion that the attention which has been made in the practice of the Board, by attending to individual applications, has had the result of diminishing the amount of that combination, and of making the schools more of a separate character than they were before?—The effect has been, certainly, to place the schools more under the management of individuals of different religious persuasions; but I think there is nothing in the fact, even though it be admitted, to prevent united instruction, although the result has been that schools under Roman Catholic patronage are principally attended (especially in Roman Catholic localities) by children of that persuasion. In the North of Ireland,



where the population is more mixed, you will find, by the returns furnished to Parliament, that there is a much larger amount of mixed education than in the other three provinces."

And at No. 116, Viscount Hutchinson says—

"You were undertaken to state that it was only after 1840 that you entertained applications from single individuals?—There were many, I have no doubt, previous to

that date, but the general rule was, that if they came from persons of different religious denominations, they should have the preference in case the Board could not act on all."

23468. Will you give the summary as given in the report of the evidence?—Yes, Mr. Ouse headed in the following tabular summary, in 1854, showing the classification of all the schools, according to the creed of the patrons:—

## SUMMARY.

Parishes	Number of National Schools in Ireland under the patronage of										Total.	
	Established Church		Presbyterians		Dissenters	Roman Catholics			Unconnected with National Education	Religious not stated		
	Chapels	Large	Chapels	Large		Jointly with Protestants	Chapels	Large				
COUNTY DUBLIN	15	75	6	—	1	12	373	80	21	—	1	555
LONDON	35	73	3	5	2	9	900	87	31	11	1	1,551
MIDLANDS	12	39	2	2	—	10	721	23	65	5	1	888
WILTSHIRE	94	233	483	130	20	12	736	71	21	13	2	1,976
Total	154	432	494	135	32	43	3,800	257	118	36	5	4,602

23469. How far does that table bear out the united system as far as patronage is concerned?—My best course is to allow Mr. Ouse to answer. To question 120, I find he then answers, in 1854, the founder of the system—

"The Earl of Derby.—Do I rightly understand the return which you have now read as showing that the whole number of schools under the joint management is only forty-eight persons of different religious denominations?—Up to the date specified in those returns, there are very few schools under joint management, and I should add, that as far as my experience goes, those under joint management have given the Commissioners more trouble than any others, for they found it very difficult to unite parties of various religious denominations."

23470. That was the state of things in 1854?—Yes.

23471. How far do the O'Reilly returns make out that the system in 1862 was more successful in that point?—Now, it was remarked, a few days ago, by Mr. Ouse, in reference to a return, that I quoted, from a Parliamentary paper some years back, that the question this Commission has been appointed to consider is not what was the state of National Education then, though in point of history it is important for you to know what it was in all stages; but I will supplement that summary of 1854, by a far more minute and important one of the year 1863, after the system had been thirty years in operation, showing what was the result of united education under four great categories—No. 1, Joint Patrons; No. 2, Joint Teachers; No. 3, Joint Pupils; No. 4, Joint Religious Instruction. I mean separate religious instruction for two or more creeds in the one school. I think it will afford you a faithful picture of the united system in its main features.

I. Patrons	Schools	Per cent.
Catholic	4,267	or 68.7
Established Church	719	or 11.6
Presbyterian	823	or 13.6
Dissenters	83	or 1.3
Joint Creeds	42	or 0.7
Official—Workhouse, God, Asylum, and Model	226	or 4.1
Total	6,216	100

So that, excluding the official schools, the Poor Law, god, asylum, and model, we find that there are only seven schools in a thousand, after thirty-one years, that enjoy joint management, and as Mr. Crosworthy said, in 1854, those give more trouble than I suppose fifty times the number, under individual or denominational management. We have under the head—

II. Teachers	Schools	Per cent.
All Catholics	4,405	or 70.6
Protestants	1,256	or 20.3
Mixed	195	or 3.1
Total	6,196	100

  

III. Pupils	Schools	Per cent.
All Catholics	3,360	or 59.1
Protestants	154	or 2.6
Mixed	3,025	or 50.4
Total	6,539	100

I am sure that the friends of united education must feel highly delighted to see such a large number, namely—the majority of the schools, 58.4 per cent., having a mixture; but it is an utter delusion. When we come to analyse it, we find it is what is called the fallacy of composition. Now I will take the lower grades of religious minorities, one by one—

Religious Minorities—	Schools	Per cent. of Total National Schools
One Catholic pupil on Roll, in year,		
in	68	426, or 32.6
Protestant	374	
Two Catholics	70	
Protestants	365	416, or 11.6
Three Catholics	51	
Protestants	942	313, or 8.2
Four Catholics	34	
Protestants	182	218, or 6.1
Five Catholics	47	
Protestants	141	188, or 5.3
Six to nine Catholics	172	
Protestants	323	433, or 12.6
One to nine Catholics	396	
Protestants	1,628	2,024 or 37.4

I take the small minority, nine on Roll, which gives a mixture of three, in daily attendance, so that upwards of 57 per cent. of the so-called mixed schools have minorities of three, two, one, or less, daily. But if you further deduct 236 official schools; workhouse schools, where no one goes by choice; god schools, where persons go by compulsion; lunatic asylums schools, where inmates have no option, one way or the other; and model schools, where persons go by special attraction, no pretence of mixed education remains.

23472. With regard to those schools that have only one or two of a different religion attending it, how many children on the roll are required to give a mixed attendance?—Fortunately we can better understand

Dec 9, 1868.  
James Wm. Kilmartin,  
Esq.

Dec 9, 1886  
James Wm  
Kavanaugh  
esq.

the question now, than any time before. We have settled that it takes three pupils on the roll to give one in attendance, therefore you are wisely to reject, as proving too necessary but only a mental exercise, the one and the two, for you must get three on the roll to secure a daily attendance of one. Therefore, two cannot count, in proving a mixed school.

23473 That is, so far as the statistics of roll returns are concerned?—These are the roll returns applied to a year, but only, as you now understand, going back over fifteen months.

23474 And of course is confined to the statistics upon the *Log* of the National Board's books?—Yes.

23475 Will you now take up the fourth category?—The fourth category applies to the separate religious instruction given in the schools. Under Lord Stanley's system you should expect a second religious instruction in every school where there was a second religious denomination, but so far from that, Catholic instruction only is given in 4,354, or in 70·1 per cent. of the schools. Protestant instruction only is given in 1,032, or 16·7 per cent. of the schools. Both Protestant and Catholic teaching is given in 521, or 8·4 per cent. of the schools, chiefly official schools, workhouses, jail, model, &c.

None is given, or there is no return, as to 306, or 4·9 per cent. of the schools, making a total of 6,316 schools.

Schools		Per cent
IV. Religious Instruction.		
Catholic, only,	4,354	or 70·1
Protestant only,	1,032	or 16·4
Both Protestant and Catholic,	521	or 8·4
None, or no Return,	306	or 4·9
Total,	6,216	100

If you desire it I can give you an analysis of the schools, of 1867, showing their condition five years later than 1862; but there are no similar minute returns of this kind, later than the O'Reilly returns. I can give you important returns, however, with regard to the distribution of mixed schools, in 1867.

23476 Will you give that?—With pleasure. I have a table before me of mixed and unmixed schools in 1867.

23477 The *Classification*—Is that compiled by yourself?—Compiled by myself, from the report of the National Board, for the year 1867. This is an analysis of 4,382 schools, grouped in five categories of mixed and unmixed schools.

#### MIXED AND UNMIXED NATIONAL SCHOOLS, 1867.

Class or Group	Schools in category		Chief of Teachers	Catholic			Protestant			Total		
				Number	Per cent.	Average per School	Number	Per cent.	Average per School	Number	Per cent.	Average per School
	Number	Per cent.										
1	2,365	37·1	Catholic,	360,887	49·0	152·6	—	—	—	360,887	38·6	152·4
2	1,592	41·5	"	360,887	49·0	152·6	24,844	14·4	9·4	385,731	38·8	152·8
3	129	2·0	Mixed,	13,228	1·8	100·5	14,025	8·4	112·8	26,053	2·1	512·8
4	297	3·1	Protestant,	—	—	—	19,867	14·2	100·8	19,867	2·1	100·5
5	1,039	15·8	"	29,481	4·0	28·8	115,864	46·1	131·5	145,345	15·9	160
	6,382	100	Total and averages,	755,381	100	112·9	179,729	100	27·4	935,110	100	142

In the first group there are 2,365 schools under Roman Catholic teachers, being only 37·1 per cent. of all the National schools in Ireland. These 2,365 schools are attended by 360,887 children, all of whom are Roman Catholics. That number forms 49 per cent. of the 737,161 Catholics attending all the schools, which on an average is 152·6 Catholics to every one of these 2,365 unmixed schools, thus forming 38·6 per cent. of all the children on the rolls of the whole of the 6,382 National schools. In 2,649 other schools, under Catholic teachers only, or 41·5 per cent. of the whole of the schools, there are 353,545 Catholic children, being 45·2 per cent. of the whole of the Catholic children, and an average of 125·9 Catholic pupils in each school, mixed with 24,844 Protestants, 14·2 of all the Protestants attending the schools, or 9·4 Protestants in each school, making a total of that sort of mixture of 358,379 Catholics and Protestants, or 39·3 per cent. of all the children in the National schools in Ireland. The next group of schools we come to are the schools under mixed teachers, of which there are only 129, or 2·0 per cent. of the whole, attended by 13,228 Roman Catholic children, or 1·8 of all the Roman Catholic children, mixed with 14,025 Protestants, or 8·4 per cent. of all the Protestants, making a total of 28,053 Protestants and Catholics, or 3·1 per cent. of the whole attendance in National schools. Now, we come to the first group of Protestant schools, those under an exclusively Protestant staff, 197, or 3·1 of all the schools, attended by 19,867 Protestants only, and no Roman Catholics, or 11·3 per cent. of all the Protestants in attendance, or 2·1 per cent. of all the children in all the schools. Lastly, we come to the fifth category—schools also under a Protestant staff only, 1,039 schools, or 16·4 per cent. of the whole, attended by 29,481 Roman Catholics, or 4 per cent. of all the Roman Catholics, or an

average of 28·8 per cent. Roman Catholics to each of these schools, mixed with 115,864 Protestants, 111·5 in each school, or 66·1 per cent. of all the Protestants in the schools, making a total of 145,345 children, Protestant and Catholic, in these schools, or 15·9 per cent. of all the children attending the schools, being a grand total of 6,382 schools, classed into these five categories, attended by 737,161 Roman Catholics, and 179,370 Protestants.

23478 Mr. Sullivan.—All these numbers represent roll numbers?—Yes, roll numbers, the total number on the roll for 1867.

23479 Have you any further statement that you wish to read with regard to the existence of the religious rules?—No, not at present. No defence, whatever, can be put forward by statutes, or by educationalists, for applying the restrictions of a mixed system of education to the first and fourth categories, namely, 2,365 Catholic schools, attended by Catholics exclusively, and 197 Protestant schools attended by Protestants exclusively, these two classes of schools having about 43 per cent. of all the pupils in them. It can hardly be defended, the minority being so small in the 2,649 other Catholic schools, with small minorities of non-Protestants on the roll, that the rule can be legitimately applied to restrict the religious instruction of all the other children—while the same principle, as to extreme minorities, is, *absolute* *exclusive*, applied to 1,039 Protestant schools, with extreme Catholic minorities. Counting all these, then, the only schools you have to legislate for are 132 mixed schools, chiefly model, workhouse, jail, and hospital asylum schools.

23480 Have you any statement to hand in, in order to complete any portion of the evidence with regard to the rules for religious instruction?—I have not. I think to-day's evidence is sufficient. I refer to the

Dec. 3, 1868.

James Wm. Keene, Esq.

statements made by me, in my letter of 1854, already put in evidence, so that, up to that time, the Commissioners had scarcely given any purely educational or scholastic attention to the main business assigned to them, namely, the education of the people; that the Board, at their meetings, the staff of the central office, and the Inspectors, had much of their time occupied looking after rules that, in great part, are wholly imaginary in their application, if you accept the existing state of things, as set forth in this table. It is the result of an experiment, after thirty-seven years' operation, or more than the lifetime of a whole generation. The people have settled down, as regards education, into the attitude you see, in relation to our system. There is no such thing, practically, as mixed education in any substantial way in Ireland; and, where it exists, it is an unmitigated evil, as my recent tour in the North proves.

23481. I ask you to look at this copy of a letter, on the subject of National education in Ireland, addressed to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Right Hon. E. Cardwell, M.P., by certain members of the House of Commons, under date 10th of August, 1868—Parliamentary paper 213, year 1861—I do so.

23482. Read the paragraph of that letter, stating the opinion of those members of the House of Commons, with regard to the fact of the Rules of the Board having been changed.—

"The changes made in the system of National education have been very numerous. That, in their cumulative effect, they have had a grievous and anticipated, when each of them was successively made, will now be done by few. That, through them, the system has been effected in its fundamental principles and its essential characteristics, is a fact, not merely avowed, but willingly and warmly accepted, in pamphlets and public speeches, by various Protestant clergymen, and especially by Archbishop Steward. These gentlemen affirm that, but for (the change in) opinion, they could not conscientiously have joined that system; but that, owing to them, they now enjoy opportunities of inculcating on children in free schools, out of their own faith, those religious doctrines which they hold specially precious—opportunities even more lavishly than those formerly accorded to them by the Kildare-place Society. In their evidence, given before the Parliamentary Commission, and in that given by Mr. McCarty, Mr. Carlin, and other persons concerned with the administration of the system, similar statements are repeated. Now, the institution of National Education in Ireland, since the withdrawal of the grant to the Kildare-place Society, involved a concept of no ordinary character. From it even the suspension of proscription was to be excluded, and it was pronounced a principle no less sacred in the political than in the moral sphere, viz.: that "we should do to others as we wish others to do to us"—a principle for which the pedants and the people of Ireland had long contended, in vain. The successive changes to which we referred were, in several cases, urged by their respective advocates as experiments, and their effects could only be ascertained by experience. They were with few exceptions, made in direct opposition to the original principles and provisions of the system, as comprehensively set forth in Lord Stanley's letter. You rule, accordingly, and on several occasions, so that document, as the exposed and authoritative standard of the National system. "The principles of that system," you state, "were clearly laid down by the Earl of Derby, in the well-known letter addressed by him to the Duke of Leinster, in the year 1831," and further on you fully remark, with reference to certain provisions, which are lamented, "the principles recorded in Lord Derby's letter appear to afford no opening for any such incident," you proceed, "if any general law is to exist, in practice, the members of any Church are entitled to bring their children under the notice of those in authority. From whatever source such a representation might proceed, it would not fail to receive the most careful attention. It, certainly, would not fail to do so, when made by the spiritual parents of by far the larger number of pupils receiving education in the schools."

23483. Does not that passage, supported by the names of nearly all the Roman Catholic members of the House of Commons, show that, whether rightly or wrongly, the Roman Catholics in Ireland were under the belief that the fundamental rules of the system had been changed?—Not only they believe it, but they indicate the grounds that convinced them of it.

23484. The Chairman.—Do you consider that when the scheme was first being organized, the provision that the minority should receive religious instruction in the schools was one to which much importance was attached?—The greatest, my lord, as the Curator of Dr. Doyle, already cited by me, proves, because, with a poor population like the scattered agricultural peasantry in Ireland—I speak especially with confidence with regard to Roman Catholics—an weekly instruction by Sunday school, given in the chapel, no appeal from the clergyman, for a sermon once a week, even if he could confine his sermons to simply catechetical instruction, for the children, would ever ground a large population, like the Irish people, in the summary of the Law of God, as they have it in their Catechism, or train the children in habits of Christian piety.

23485. It has for a considerable number of years I believe ceased to be a custom of the clergy of the minority to either add to frequent opposition schools for that purpose?—In no school under Protestant management in the North of Ireland that I went through, did I find one instance. In one vested Roman Catholic school, in Donegal, not only was there opportunity afforded, as there should be, under the rule, but I grieve to say that the Roman Catholic teacher taught three catechisms—Catholic, Anglican, and Presbyterian—in three corners of the school-room—a most reprehensible practice.

23486. Was it ever a practice of the clergymen of the minority to go into an opposition school-room, and communicate religious instruction?—It was, my lord, but never, I must say, to any great extent. There was that distinction recognized as to schools, especially from the time the Presbyterian body joined. It was acknowledged that, from that to this, the system was denominational, and although it was open, under the rules, to men of my sort, to go in and exercise the rights of visitors, persons have almost the same hesitancy to go into a denominational school, of a different creed, as they would to go into a church not their own.

23487. Might I understand that such a power was only exercised in a small degree at first, and soon ceased to be practically employed at all?—You are quite right, my lord, in so understanding it; and in the year 1854, when asked the same question that your lordship asks me, I stated that after all my experience in the four provinces of Ireland, as District and Head Inspector, I never knew one instance of an extreme minority where it was availed of, by clergymen or laymen, to go and give religious instruction—even one.

23488. Then, at the time that distinction was made between vested and non-vested schools, the privilege given to the patron of non-vested schools was practically one which he enjoyed beforehand?—In point of practice it was as you state, up to the recognition of that distinction for the Presbyterians in 1840; but, my lord, there was a great, an immense difference, between depriving persons of a right, if they chose to exercise it, and depriving them of that right in deference to another body. In point of principle it makes a very great difference.

23489. In point of practice was it of any great moment?—Not of any great moment, my lord, in point of practice.

23490. As far as the manner of religion was concerned it was a restriction?—It was, it was a denial of a right that no one deprives more cordially or manfully than Lord Stanley himself.

23491. In respect to the patron, it was a change in favour of religious liberty?—Not at all. Quite the contrary. It was a change made in deference to the conscientious objections of the Presbyterian body to allow the school to be closed on a day in the week, to let the Roman Catholic priest occupy the room, and

We are, &c.  
G. DOUGHERTY.  
W. MENNELL.  
G. GAY.  
JAMES McCANN.  
JOHN A. BARRIE.  
GEORGE BENTLEY.  
JOHN BART.  
JOHN DALLMAN ACTON.  
J. PETER HENNING.

(Signed).  
CANTLEBERRY.  
R. MOORE O'FARRELL.  
JOSEPH FRANCIS MARTINE.  
W. H. E. COGAN.  
LAWRENCE WARDEN.  
JOHN EMMERTON.  
O'DONNELL DOG.  
JOHN LUNDEN.  
D. O'DONNELL.  
EDWARD M'EVOT.

Dec. 3, 1858.

James Wm.  
Kavanaugh,  
esq.

teach a doctrine that they disapproved, under the shelter of the school.

23493. *Rev. Dr. Wilson*.—Night Roman Catholic children, if they chose, attend on and receive religious instruction given by a Protestant teacher in National schools at any time from 1832 to 1837.—The term "religious instruction" may mean either their own religious instruction or adverse religious instruction. I understood the drift of Dr. Wilson's question to mean, night Roman Catholic children, from 1832 to 1837, attend non-Catholic religious instruction, given by a Protestant teacher in a National school, if the children chose. I say not. It was never a question at all of the children—it was a question of the parent.

23493. Then, if the parents chose to allow their children, might they attend on such instruction?—No, they should direct them to attend; and there is a great difference between allow and direct. They should, beforehand, direct them.

23494. Do you regard Lord Stanley as a good authority upon that point?—I regard Lord Stanley, by his letter, to be an authority, but not much outside of that.

23495. Did you not quote, just now, statements by Lord Derby as authoritative, on me you not disposed to rely on them?—I rely on Lord Stanley as an excellent exponent of his own letter, and that it was perfectly competent to Lord Stanley to say whether a certain change of rule was a departure from any portion of that letter or not.

23496. Should you regard an extract from a letter of Lord Stanley, read before a Committee of the House of Lords, of which he himself was a member, by a witness, as an authoritative document?—I should receive, with respect anything coming from Lord Stanley, but so far as the question is concerned, I would not take Lord Stanley—I would take nothing but the rules and regulations of the Board, and no Government, no statesman, or no individual Commissioner—nothing but the rules and regulations, and the reports and official documents of the Board.

23497. When were the rules and regulations of the Board enacted in which you place such confidence—what was the first time?—From December 1831 up to 1847.

23498. Should you not regard Lord Stanley as a fair exponent of the principles of the system which he introduced?—Certainly, with regard to the principles then, and now, and always, with regard to the principles, but as to rules and regulations, he is no authority, whatever.

23499. Before a Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1837, Mr. Carile read an extract from a letter of Lord Stanley, which will be found on page 104. Read the extract beginning with "But there is not," near the close? (Reads).—

"But there is not nor ever was any objection to the reading of the Scriptures, or the giving of any other religious instruction on days and hours to be specified by the local patrons, to those children whose parents chose that they should attend. Those days and hours, however, was to be specified, in order to remove from the mind of the Roman Catholic parent the possibility of a supposition that his children may be introduced to jobs in studies of which he does not approve, nor is there any objection to the application of the term 'school hours' to those portions of time, provided they are distinguished from the hours of unusual and necessary attendance."

23500. Does not that language show Lord Stanley's view to be that all along in the history of the system, Roman Catholic children might attend from 1832 to 1839, and receive religious instruction from a Protestant teacher, and in a school under a Protestant manager, and that if such children should absent themselves it was at their own option, and the result of the action of their parents, and not of the managers and teachers?—I am astounded, Dr. Wilson, with the greatest respect for you, how anyone could put forward that mere extract from Lord Stanley's celebrated letter to the Presbyterian deputation, in 1838, in support of the statement you make, as the full answer, then given, by Lord Stanley, when the system had only just been launched, proves the very contrary.

23501. I am quite satisfied to—Allow me to content it with the sentence before it—"text by context" is an honest Protestant mode of interpretation. Lord Stanley reviewing the proposition made by the Presbyterians, to have a Bible class during the ordinary school hours, for combined, or united instruction, says, "those hours, be they more or be they fewer, will be allotted to other studies, and in them, of course, neither a Bible nor any other book can be employed to which the parents or guardians of any of the children could object on the ground of religious scruples. To introduce the reading or hearing of any such book, during the ordinary school hours, viz. those during which the children of all denominations are expected to attend, would be a palpable violation of religious liberty of conscience." Lord Stanley was astounded at anyone proposing such a thing.

[Adjourned.]

# SIXTiETH DAY—DUBLIN, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1859

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of PARR, Chairman.

The Right Hon. the Earl of DESHER, K.P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACKAY.  
The Right Hon. Mr. JUSTICE MORRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKS, Esq., M.C.

REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
REV. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, D.D.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NATHAN STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.P.  
LAWRENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C. } Secretaries  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

Feb. 11, 1859.

Henry M.  
Palkington,  
esq., & Co.

HENRY MULOCK PALKINGTON, Esq., Q.C., Honorary Secretary of the Sunday School Society for Ireland.  
sworn and examined.

23502. *Master Brooks*.—I understand you have drawn up a paper containing the substance of what you propose to offer in evidence?—Yes, I have drawn up a paper.

23503. Will you have the kindness to read it?

"I have been Hon. Secretary of the 'Sunday School Society for Ireland' since the death of Mr. James Irvine last

year, and I have been elected a member of the successive committees in each of the last sixteen years—since the 10th April, 1839. I am acquainted with the working of the Society.

"It was formed in 1809 'for the purpose of promoting the establishment, and facilitating the conducting of Sunday schools.'

"It is not limited in its operations to any one denomination.

tion of Protestants. It assists members of the Established Church, Presbyterians, Methodists, and other Protestant denominations.

"The Committee endeavours to carry out the objects of the Society by supplying the managers of schools with 'aggregations for the forming and conducting of Sunday schools,' published by the Society, roll books to enable the managers to record the names, number, and attendance of the pupils, class books for the teachers, that they may have the names, residences, and attendance of the children in their respective classes; a book called 'The Absent Scholar Report Book,' to secure as far as possible the meeting by the teachers of the absent children; alphabets and spelling cards; spelling and reading books, published by the Society; Bibles, Testaments, concordances for the teachers; portions of Scripture, tickets for rewards, with Scripture subjects and calendars of Scripture lessons for the year.

"There are given either gratuitously or at reduced prices. Since 1825 no estimate in money has been given.

"The Committee employ travelling agents, who, as far as our means enable us, are sent to visit the schools, and who report the state of the schools visited, to the Committee.

"The Society is entirely supported by voluntary contributions, including grants of Bibles and Testaments, from the Irish Bible Society, and the British and Foreign Bible Society.

"The income of the Society for the year ending 31st March, 1866, consisted of £1,532 7s 2d in money, and £1,084 17s 7d in Bibles and Testaments given by the Irish Bible Society, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, making in all £2,617 5s.

"In the first year of the Society there were only two schools in connection with it, attended by 67 scholars; and so far as the Society has been able to ascertain, there were then only eighty Sunday schools in Ireland.

"In this year there are 3,495 schools connected with the Society, containing 197,329 pupils, and 18,131 gratuitous teachers; of the pupils 129,947 are reported as reading the Scriptures.

"From the returns forwarded to us from 1,503 schools, it appears that 77,382 of the pupils were receiving instruction in week-day schools; and taking these returns as the basis of the calculation for the remaining 352 schools, which have not supplied the information on this head, we estimate that of the 197,329 pupils, 25,743 are receiving instruction in week-day schools, thus leaving 171,586 attending Sunday schools only. But of the whole number attending the schools 50,956 are above the age of 15 years, who perhaps could not be expected to attend daily schools, which would leave 120,630 under the age of 15 years depending for their instruction entirely on the Sunday schools. I find that this proportion has remained nearly the same for several years, as the following table will show:—

TABLE A.

	Year ending 31st December.				
	1874.	1884.	1894.	1904.	1914.
Total Number of Scholars.	198,387	193,097	194,179	192,823	197,329
Proportion attending Daily Schools.	97,513	97,424	93,840	96,383	96,743
Receiving instruction in Sunday Schools only.	100,874	97,673	98,523	96,440	96,586
Above 15 years.	84,008	82,582	80,810	81,120	80,996
Under 15 years.	46,100	45,541	45,023	48,320	47,590

"The accompanying table marked B shows the number of scholars, pupils, and teachers in each decade since the formation of the Society, showing a large increase up to 1860, and some decrease since that period.

TABLE B.—NUMBER OF SCHOLARS, PUPILS, AND GRATUITOUS TEACHERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE SOCIETY AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.

November, 1820, the Society established.—In 1810 only two schools in connection.

Year.	Schools.	Scholars.	Teachers.
April, 1819.	762	81,314	—
Jan., 1820.	2,283	183,490	16,837
1823.	3,046	220,890	21,898
1849.	2,336	224,171	90,108
1859.	2,499	216,316	19,634
1860.	2,455	197,329	18,131

"The table marked C gives the number of schools, pupils, and teachers in each of the provinces on the 1st January, 1860.

TABLE C.—THE NUMBER FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31st JANUARY, 1860, AS ABOVE, STATED AS FOLLOWS IN THE SEVERAL PROVINCES.—

Province.	Schools.	Scholars.	Teachers.
Ulster.	1,847	148,567	13,997
Leinster.	490	29,133	2,954
Munster.	229	10,593	1,316
Connaught.	152	6,456	764

Total in connection as above.

2,475 197,329 18,131

"So far as I can judge from the reports to the Society, the decrease has been caused partly by emigration, and partly by the establishment in 1861 or 1862 of another Sunday School Society in Belfast, connected with the Presbyterian Church.

"The numbers are again increasing, the year ending 31st December, 1860 showing an increase over the preceding year of 1,436 pupils, and an increase of 3,097 over the year 1866.

"I may observe that the Society was never more efficient, and never more needed than it is now.

"In the year 1860 we issued the several Bibles, Testaments, and other Sunday school requisites, mentioned in table D.

TABLE D.—ISSUE OF BOOKS IN THE YEAR 1860.

	Unissued.	At Reduced Price.	Total.
Bibles.	2,495	8,206	18,004
Testaments.	8,514	905	9,519
Spelling Books and Reading Books.	14,312	1,110	15,422
Portions of Scripture.	—	279	279
Concordances.	—	252	252
Portions of Bibles, Class Books, Hints and Suggestions.	3,315	2,567	5,482

In addition to the above, there was a large issue of Scripture Lessons, Scripture Subjects, and a Calendar of Scripture Lessons.

"As to the effects of the Sunday school system, I think I may say that, in the country parts of Ireland at least, the children who attend Sunday schools may be distinguished from those who do not, by habits of order and cleanliness, and by a better acquaintance of the Scripture. It excites an improved attendance of both parents and children at public worship. There is an affectionate bond of union established between the children and their teachers, which tends to bind together the different classes of society, the effect of which is felt not merely while in the school-room, but during the week—and not only while the relationship of pupil and teacher continues, but through life. Of the goodness of this union we have frequent examples—letters having been sent to us by teachers, which had been received from former pupils, written from India, America, Australia, and various other parts of the world, referring with gratitude to the Sunday schools in which the writers had been trained."

23504. With reference to the remarkable fact which you have stated, that nearly 50,000 Protestant children have no means of instruction whatever but what are afforded by the Sunday schools, may I ask in writing taught in the Sunday schools?—Never to my knowledge. We make no condition. We don't inter-

Feb. 11, 1869.  
Henry M.  
Pitt-Rivers,  
Esq. &c.

Feb. 18, 1850.

Henry M.  
Pilkington,  
Esq., &c.

free with the internal arrangement of the schools. Upon making inquiry and upon looking through the reports I found that at an early period of the Society's existence, after it was established, in 1800 and 1810, writing was occasionally taught. I have reason to believe it is not taught in any Sunday school now.

23505. Of course arithmetic is not taught!—It is not taught. The schools are entirely for religious instruction. The teaching of spelling and reading is merely with a view to enable the teachers eventually to give religious instruction.

23506. Then, there are 50,000 children learning only to read and not receiving instruction in any other branches of education!—Yes. Of course I speak, on all this evidence, from the returns given to our society, which I have every reason to believe are correct.

23507. Have you ever attempted to investigate the causes why so large a proportion of children as 50,000 are not sent to week-day schools!—Frequently. In the province of Ulster, where, as you may observe, the greater number of our schools are, the children are employed in manufactures. Some years ago Scotch houses employed numbers of females in extraordinary work. That has been reported to us frequently as the cause of their not attending week-day schools. That is not so much the case now; but still the numbers are very great that do not attend any week-day school. As to the boys, there is a great deal of employment both at manufactures and upon farms in the North of Ireland. You are aware there is a great deal of flax culture in the North, as well as of manufactures, and the boys are employed at these.

23508. Have you reason to think that a considerable number go into life without any knowledge of writing or arithmetic!—It is very possible that some of those that are returned to us at a particular time as not attending any day school, may have previously attended week-day schools for a short time. But they certainly go into life very imperfectly educated, and many, I am sure, without any education except what they receive in the Sunday school. It is a constant complaint of our correspondents that they cannot get attendance at the week-day schools; for many of the managers of Sunday schools have week-day schools also.

23509. It is part of the system to create a very lively interest between the teachers and the taught and to follow the children to their homes!—Yes, I have stated to you that one of the books we issue is an *Absent Scholars' Report Book*, in which the teacher is expected to report the cause of absence, and that he has visited the children. Of course it is desirable that as far as possible that should be carried out.

23510. The *Children's*—What proportion of those children do you suppose have never learned to read before they came to the Sunday schools!—I cannot answer your lordship that; I cannot say they have never learned to read, I can only answer from our returns. I have the form of our returns, showing the information which we require from the managers of our schools, and that matter does not enter into it. The questions which we require to be answered by each person who replies to us for aid are these:—“How many scholars are there on the books? How many scholars usually attend? How many of the scholars on the books are reading the Bible or Testament? How many of the scholars on the books are above the age of fifteen years? How many of the scholars on the books of the Sunday school attend any day school? How many teachers attend the school?” and so on.

23511. Is there a huge demand upon your stores for the alphabets, books, and cards, used for teaching elementary branches!—A very large demand.

23512. I think I understood you to refer the number of children in the North of Ireland who don't attend day schools to the facility with which they get employment in manufactures!—Yes.

23513. How would you explain with respect to the other three provinces the fact that so many children do not frequent week-day schools!—In the other three provinces our numbers are comparatively small. Al-

though the numbers in the other three provinces enter into our calculations, yet you will observe from the tables I have read how small they are. Whilst we have 118,467 children attending our schools in Ulster we have only 8,494 attending our schools in Connaught. Our schools are intended for Protestants, and, of course, they have not anything like the same demand upon them in the other provinces that they have in Ulster.

23514. Are you aware whether many of the children attending your schools also go on week-days to either National Board schools or Church Education schools!—I am not aware. We don't ask that question. We have given the proportion who attend week-day schools of some sort—we don't ask what schools.

23515. Rev. Sir, then—You say your Society is not limited to one denomination of Protestants!—Yes.

23516. So far in connection with Protestants it is a catholic institution!—It is.

23517. How is your committee appointed!—Our committee is appointed annually.

23518. From the subscribers!—From the subscribers.

23519. Is any note taken of the proportion of the different Protestant denominations as to the membership of the committee!—No. I dare say if I were to go over the names of the committee I could tell, but I have it not upon my mind. I have the names here.

23520. Your Society it appears, gives assistance to Presbyterians, Methodists, and other Protestant Denominations, as well as to parties connected with the Established Church!—It does.

23521. Does your Society also, as a matter of course, recognise as entitled to membership of the committee parties connected with these denominations!—We have had a member of the Presbyterian Church on our committee. I don't think we have had a Baptist or a Methodist whilst I have been on the committee.

23522. Had you not a Presbyterian Minister on your committee last year!—No. The last Presbyterian Minister on our committee was the Rev. Dr. Hall.

23523. Did he cease to be a member!—Yes.

23524. On what grounds can you say!—Yes I am. He ceased under these circumstances. I think it is five or six years ago. Some two or three years before that, he had been elected a member of our committee.

23525. And had acted as such!—And had acted as such, and advocated our cause at our public meetings. I cannot be very accurate as to the date, but some five or six years ago, he became a Commissioner of the National Board, and inasmuch as the National education question is a party question almost, I may say, in this country, and as a great number of our supporters had very strong opinions upon that question, it was determined by a majority of the committee, on a division, that he should not be re-elected at the next annual meeting.

23526. Then do you regard the National education question in this country as a party question!—When I say a party question I mean it is a question upon which parties are very much divided—I don't mean parties in the sense of political, but members of the Church of England clergymen who are our supporters are strongly averse to the National system, and a great many of our supporters are favourable to it. I was one of those who wished Dr. Hall to remain.

23527. Your subscribers and supporters include both those favourable to the National system of education and those not favourable to it. Should you have supposed that a committee managing the Sunday school should not recognise this as an element at all in the case!—My own opinion was that it should not be recognised as an element, but I thought the rest of the committee had good reason for wishing that a person should come to be a member of the committee when he became a member of the National Board. I think his continuing on the committee would have injured the funds of the Society. I myself, and several members of the committee, thought we should disregard it.

23538. The Society does not regard all the members of the committee as bound to hold the same opinions on that subject?—Certainly not.

23539. Did not Dr. Hall differ on other questions as well as the education question from many of your subscribers?—I think it is very likely he did.

23540. Should I understand you to say that before your Society came into existence there were any Sunday schools in Ireland?—As far as we can ascertain there were eighty. One of our questioners, "When was the Sunday school established?" When we find it stated in answer to that question that the Sunday school was established at any early period, we take a note of it, and having the correspondence extending over sixty years, I think we may conclude we have the dates of the first establishment of all the Sunday schools.

23541. You could not say to what body those eighty Sunday schools belonged?—I could not.

23542. You assist the Sunday schools under the management of the different Protestant denominations. Could you state the sentiment given to Presbyterian Sunday schools?—I could not. I could have done so, perhaps, if I had got notice that the information would be required.

23543. Methodist Sunday schools?—No. I could have done so if I had known I should be asked; but I should state that I could only do it by asking the officers of the Society on the subject. Our books would not show it. We don't ask the religion of the parties. Every person applying for aid in the first instance for a new school must refer to some person known to us, and that is a guarantee that the applicant is a party we ought to assist. We don't ask the religion of the applicant.

23544. Could you give the Commissioners any information as to the number of Sunday schools under Roman Catholics at any time?—None, whatever. I have no means whatever of knowing. Our schools are intended for Protestants.

23545. Do you think emigration would largely account for the diminution of scholars from the year 1849 to the year 1859?—I know emigration has been stated to us as the cause. I have looked over the reports from our correspondents with a view to this emigration, and I find that emigration has been given as a cause of the diminution of the number of children attending the schools from very shortly after 1849.

23546. The diminution has been greater during the last decade from 1850 than during the previous one?—Yes, it has. I think that is not altogether accounted for by emigration, but by the establishment of the Sunday School Society in Belfast connected with the Presbyterian Church.

23547. The Sunday School Society in connexion with the Presbyterian Church is disorganised for all Ireland?—I don't know, but I think it is.

23548. Do you note the religious denominations of the children attending your Sunday schools?—No.

23549. Mr. Walbran.—Do you print and publish a report annually?—Yes; annually.

23550. Have you got a copy of your last report?—I have. The time for printing the report for the past year will be in about a month.

23551. The Lord Bishop of Meath.—Can you say what proportion the number of Sunday schools make your society bears to all the Sunday schools in Ireland?—I could not state the proportion. There are a great many Sunday schools not supported by us. A great many, originally brought into operation by our society, and the managers of which can now do without our aid, and they very kindly don't ask us for aid, knowing that our funds are extremely small. I know there are a great many Sunday schools not connected with us.

23552. Mr. Stoker.—Do your returns enable you to tell how many of the 50,000 young persons who attended Sunday schools only ever did attend day schools?—No.

23553. Did all the 50,000 at some time or other attend more or less at day schools?—It is possible, not probable.

23554. The Lord Bishop of Meath.—Have you made any analysis of the returns, so as to ascertain the religious denominations of these 50,000 children?—I have not.

23555. Mr. Walbran.—Could you ascertain that?—I hardly think it could be made. We should assume, in the first place, that a Presbyterian school had none but Presbyterian children in it, a Church of England school none but Church of England children. We should resort to the accidental knowledge of the officers who happen to be a long time in office to ascertain it.

23556. Mr. Justice Morris.—You don't make any record as to the religion of the scholars except that they are Protestants of some denomination?—None.

23557. The Commissioners.—Are there any buildings in Ireland used exclusively as Sunday schools and not as week-day schools connected with your society?—There are. We have no school buildings, belonging to us, but frequently in a building used for a day school, a Sunday school is held also, but in hundreds of cases Sunday schools are held in private houses—in hundreds of cases they are held in out-houses. It is not merely to elargeness we make grants. Laymen also manage Sunday schools under the society in a great many instances.

23558. Are any of the Sunday schools held in schools which are connected with the National Board?—I am not aware. I never heard.

23559. Are there any held in Church Education schools?—There are. We have a great many beneficed clergymen of the Church of England who have Sunday schools, and get grants from us, who have schools under the Church Education Society also.

23560. Mr. Sullivan.—I see spelling books mentioned in the last report as No. 1 and No. 2—what books are they?—They are published by the Sunday School Society.

23561. Have you had an opportunity of comparing them with the elementary books of the National Board?—I am acquainted with the elementary books of the National Board. We borrow these books recently.

23562. What class-book of the National Board would your No. 1 book compare with?—No. 1 is a spelling-book. It is for the first lessons in reading. It contains short words.

23563. No. 2 book—what would that compare with?—No. 2 is a little farther advanced.

23564. Would that go as far as the Third Book of the National Board?—No; it is difficult to institute a comparison between them; inasmuch as our society is for religious instruction, our books are exclusively for religious instruction; therefore our reading-book is taken exclusively from the Bible.

23565. My reason for asking the question is that I see by the report that 1,880,000 copies of No. 1 and 2 Book have been issued by your society, and if No. 1 and 2 Books are not equal to No. 3 Book of Lessons of the National Board it would imply that the larger proportion of the children are scarcely able to read. Would I be right in drawing that conclusion?—I think a large proportion are unable to read.

23566. The Commissioners.—Is it that they have lost the power of reading, or that they never possessed it?—I think they never possessed it.

23567. Master Brooke.—Do you mean to say that in the Sunday schools, generally speaking, the majority of the children are not able to read?—I don't say the majority, I say a great many—not the majority. Perhaps I ought to limit it. The majority of those who don't attend any other school.

23568. Mr. Stokes.—In the 50,000 young persons not attending day schools do you include those over fifteen years?—No. There are 38,516 who are reported to us as not attending day schools, of these 47,069 are under fifteen.

23569. Master Brooke.—Do you know whether there are any Roman Catholic children attending the schools?—We have no means of knowing. They are intended for Protestants. Independently of the returns I have heard of a few, but they are very few I believe.

Feb 11, 1860  
Henry M. Pakenham,  
Esq., &c.

Feb 11, 1869  
Henry M.  
Pillington,  
esq., &c.

23560. The *Chairman*.—Are you able, by referring to papers, to state the exact number of those children who are able to read?—Yes. Out of the 197,359 attending there are reported to be able to read the Scriptures 139,927. That leaves 67,332 who are not able to read the Scriptures, and, probably, that means not able to read at all.

23561. Mr. *Stallens*.—What are the ages?—There are of all ages who attend.

23562. Mr. *Stallens*.—When children are able to read the Second Book do they then take up the Bible?—They then take up the Bible.

23563. The *Chairman*.—Do you attribute the existence of this large number of children who are unable to read the Bible wholly to the amount of occupation for young children which the manufactures of the North of Ireland afford?—Not by any means wholly, but in part. Firstly to the poverty of their parents, who are obliged to employ them in ordinary agricultural labour, and partly to carelessness as to education, but principally to poverty, and in the North of Ireland to the employment afforded by manufactures.

23564. Mr. *Stallens*.—Have you any means of distinguishing the provinces in that?—I have the provinces distinguished as to the number of schools, the number of children, and the number of teachers; but I have not the provinces distinguished as to the numbers who can read. If you wish for the return, it is likely I could get such a return made out.

23565. If it were not too much trouble, I would be glad to have it—I shall do so in a few days.

23566. Rev. Dr. *Wilson*.—Your scholars are, for the most part, in the northern province of Ulster?—Our largest numbers by far.

23567. Is the proportion of scholars in the province of Ulster, attending the Sabbath schools, who cannot read, large?—I have just stated that I am not at present prepared to divide into provinces those who can read and those who cannot.

23568. Have you heard that in many districts of the North of Ireland, owing to landlords not granting sites for National schools, children have been deprived of the advantages of a regular education in many districts?—I never heard of it.

23569. If such a state of things existed, would that largely account for the numbers of children who come to Sunday schools unable to read?—I should suppose it would. It would be one way of accounting for it. I never heard of it.

23570. You are not acquainted with the district of country near Moura?—I am not at all acquainted with it.

23571. Or parts of the county Donegal, near Letterkenny?—I have passed through it, but I am not so well acquainted with it as to be able to say anything about it.

[Adjourned.]

# SIXTY-FIRST DAY—FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1869.

## PRESENT.

The Right Hon. the Earl of Pavia, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. the Earl of DUBLIN, &c.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLOSING.  
The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MORRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, &c.

WILLIAM BOGGER, Esq., M.P.  
REV. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
REV. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, M.D.  
SCOTT NASHYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.P.  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., &c., } *Secretaries*.  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq., }

Feb 12, 1869  
Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell

The Right Hon. ALEXANDER MACDONNELL, *President Commissioner of National Education*, is further examined.

23572. The *Chairman*.—With regard to the constitution of the Board, do you think that, in the first instance, the system could have been established successfully without a consultative or representative element in the Board?—I believe, my lord, it is agreed on all hands that in the formation and working of the system it was absolutely necessary there should be a fair representative Board for that purpose, and that it would never have done to have had merely two or three Commissioners, however able those men might be, for moulding the system.

23573. Do you think that, in fact, such a constitution as that of the Irish Free Law Commission would not have met the object in view?—It would not. But even then the Chief Secretary and the Under Secretary, I believe, are always part of the Board.

23574. But practically they do not interfere with the ordinary working?—No, not much.

23575. Do you think it desirable that that consultative element should be continued?—I feel so confident about it that if it were not to continue I should never think for a moment of returning at this Board.

23576. What was the number of the Board at first?—Seven.

23577. When did the first increase of this number take place?—I think in 1838.

23578. Was that in consequence of a representation made by the Board that the existing number of members was not sufficient to form the requisite committee?—It was.

23579. What is the number of the Board at present when full?—The number is twenty.

\* The following table was subsequently supplied by Mr. Pillington.—

Table showing the Number of Children attending Sunday Schools connected with the Sunday School Society for Ireland; the Number of those attending Weekly Schools; the Number above 15 years of Age; and the Number reading the Scriptures, in each of the Provinces.—*See Appendix, 1869.*

	Ulster	Leinster	Munster	Connaught	Total
Total No. of Scholars on Rolls of Sunday School Society.	115,447	25,539	18,769	5,196	164,951
No. of Scholars attending Weekly Schools.	39,442	15,817	5,509	3,441	64,209
No. of Scholars above 15 years of Age.	48,437	5,342	3,146	2,072	58,997
No. of Scholars under the age of 15.	106,229	20,475	15,623	3,124	145,451
No. of Scholars able to read the Scriptures.	59,474	18,343	5,229	3,071	86,117
No. of Scholars not reading the Scriptures.	46,755	12,132	10,394	2,053	71,332

The returns made to the Sunday School Society give the number "reading the Scriptures"—there may be some able to read not included in the return as "reading the Scriptures."

H. M. PILLINGTON, *Honorary Secretary*.



Feb. 12, 1899.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

33587. How long is it since the members of the Board were equalized as regards religious professions?—They were equalized in 1869.

33588. Taking the various members of the Board of which you have had experience, ranging from seven to twenty, do you consider that, provided the religious members were evenly balanced, some smaller number than twenty would be in any way more convenient?—I do not think that there would be any convenience at all in reducing the number from my twenty to fifteen or ten. I think the number twenty is in all respects not at all too large.

33589. You do not find that it introduces too much uncertainty in the deliberations of the Board or creates a difficulty in coming to a decision?—Not at all, my lord.

33590. Do you consider now that the rules under which the Board acts have been pretty well fixed by long practice and precedent that the consultative business on which it is necessary that the opinion of the full Board should be taken requires such frequent meetings as once a week?—I don't think it is nearly so necessary as it was at the commencement of the system or even ten or fifteen years ago. I think that the rules are now from long experience much more understood, that fewer difficulties with regard to the common questions arise, and except when there is a very important case, it is not nearly of so much consequence to have a large Board summoned as it was originally.

33591. Do you think it satisfactory having weekly meetings of a large number of the members who either from their occupations or from their distance from Dublin cannot attend?—I think there is no inconvenience now, when all our common rules are so well understood, and so few difficulties arise in the entire working of the system. There would be no objection to having fortnightly instead of weekly meetings. We have only fortnightly meetings during the summer. It is only in the winter, when the town is full, and a great number of the Commissioners reside in Dublin, that we have the weekly meetings. And I do not see that there would be any sensible inconvenience if the meetings were always in future to be fortnightly meetings, reserving always the power of summoning special meetings whenever the case required.

33592. When you say "fortnightly meetings" do you mean that, strictly speaking, or twice a month?—Twice a month.

33593. Do you think your present system of weekly meetings has no tendency to throw the consultative business into the hands of two or three members?—I never observed any tendency of that sort. The weekly meetings are, generally speaking, attended by a considerable number of the Commissioners whenever there is a matter of any importance. It is sure to be known by the programme, and the communications of different sorts to the members who are not present, that an important question is before us, and they attend. There are about ten members who attend pretty regularly—some of them extremely regularly.

33594. Do you find that the system of weekly meetings impairs the control of the Resident Commissioner over the detailed administration of the office?—Not in the slightest. The only fault I could find with the working of the Board in that respect is that they are too much inclined to throw a great deal of power and responsibility on myself. Far from wishing to exercise that power themselves, their tendency always has been to be over kind and indulgent to me.

33595. And, taking the opposite side of the question, do you find it a protection and safeguard to yourself as Resident Commissioner to be able to bring the decision of important questions before the whole Board, instead of having to form an individual judgment on them?—It is a very great assistance and relief to me that such is the case.

33596. Does it relieve you of any undue pressure from any particular section or party?—No doubt, but above all I find that when I come to lay an important matter before a number of first-rate minds, many of them

persons who don't enter into the common routine management of this place, but who come fresh from the world and from great affairs, that it is of the greatest importance to be assisted by them in my judgment upon these things, and I have consistently been bound to give up my first impressions in deference to the sounder judgment these gentlemen have passed upon the case. Many of them are members of the judicial bench. A great number of our most important questions are with regard to the conduct of our Inspectors, of our Head Inspectors, and of our teachers—cases that involve the firing or dismissal of these persons—and it is of the greatest importance to me it is easy of these new and difficult questions to have the opinion of four or five of the very wisest men, I conceive, that exist in the empire in the decision of such cases.

33597. If the working head of the office were a political officer, as in England the Vice-President of the Committee of Council is, do you think that, in the circumstances of Ireland, it would still be desirable to keep up a Consultative Board such as exists at present?—I think it would be exceedingly desirable, and I am sure that if the Chief Secretary, or whoever was the political chief of this Board for the time being, were a wise man, he would be most anxious to have such a little permanent as this to consult on every important case that arose. There are about ten gentlemen who attend pretty regularly here.

33598. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is it not the fact practically that the Committees are composed of yourself, the Resident Commissioner, and the officers connected with the establishment here, for the practical working of the system?—No doubt.

33599. Rather than of yourself and the other Commissioners?—No doubt, everything that is done in these committees being done in such a way as that any of the other nineteen Commissioners can know what is done.

33600. By having such a large Board, you say you feel yourself personally relieved from considerable pressure from parties outside. On the other hand, is it not the fact that, owing to the Board being representative of religious denominations, personal pressure is brought to bear on these Commissioners, and through them on the Board generally?—No doubt there must be something of the sort. I think it is extremely fortunate it should be so. I think that unless there were persons who represented every section of the country, that approves of this system, it would be exceedingly difficult for us to know what were the true opinions, feelings, and interests of all the various sections that support the system.

33601. What do you mean by approving of the system?—Who believe that the best system that can be established in Ireland is the present united system of education.

33602. Do you still think that that is a very large class, viewed in relation both to the Roman Catholic population of the country, and the Protestants of different denominations—that a large class continue to approve of the mixed system of education?—I believe that the great majority of the Protestants of this country approve thoroughly of the present system of education established in this country. I believe that antecedents of the Catholics of Ireland look on it as the greatest blessing that has ever been conferred by England upon Ireland. I believe that, I entirely agree in the sentiment which I have heard more than once uttered by the great and good Archbishop Murray, and I believe that that is the general opinion of nine tenths even of the Catholics of Ireland.

33603. So that if parties had stated in evidence before us anything to the contrary, you don't conceive in that opinion?—I believe that great numbers of those persons who consider this to be by far the greatest blessing ever conferred by England on this country, would, if they had the power, establish a system more in accordance with Catholic opinions, but they feel that is not of the question, and they know practically the present is the best system they can obtain.

Feb. 22, 1862.  
 Right Hon.  
 Alexander  
 Macdonnell.

23597. Now, owing to the pressure of which we have been speaking, brought to bear, perhaps, upon the Commissioners personally, and then upon the Board as a united body, may not the rules sometimes be strained, and certain privileges granted to members of particular bodies which would otherwise not be conferred?—I do not believe there is anything of the sort, I believe there has been a great justice and fairness in administering this system as far as almost possible in any human affair. I should like to have any particular case brought forward, having been for thirty years connected with this Board, I am not aware of a single case having been conducted in a dishonest or jobbing spirit. Almost every eye in Ireland, the greater number hostile, has been directed upon us, and I don't know of a single job proved against us.

23598. So we act to take it that this Board of National Education will not work at any undue stretching of the rules of the Board by any manager or teacher of schools?—I am sure they would not, if the thing was proved before them. They cannot do more than that.

23599. Now, suppose sometime such pressure is brought to bear, and as you feel it to be a relief to yourself having so large a Board to aid you in that matter of pressure, do you not think that could be much better alleviated by a few fixed and definite rules from which there would be no department?—We have a code of rules which are printed, and which are observed. If you mean that the system should be reduced to a code which would be stereotyped, and never altered under the altering circumstances of the age and of Ireland, I should entirely disapprove of that. I should never be a party to such a thing.

23600. But to be altered only after sanction by Parliament?—I think that would be very inconvenient. I think Parliament would not be the proper place for discussing such subjects. It is far better these proposed changes should be first regularly discussed here, and after all the opposition offered by the minority to them, at last carried, and then Parliament consulted with regard to the propriety of these changes.

23601. Do you not think such a course as I have indicated would give greater security, and at the same time satisfy the public mind better?—I think it is very likely that part of the public mind that approved of the system, say in 1840 would infinitely prefer to have that system as they say crystallized and stereotyped, but I think the great majority of the country that do not wish to have the system crystallized, but to have it expanded and improved according to the growing circumstances of the country would look upon it as a fatal mistake.

23602. Are the Commissioners practically acquainted with the working of the system as a body?—They understand a great deal about it. They cannot understand it near so well as their Head Inspectors, and Inspectors. I myself have been a Commissioner for thirty years, and I never would pretend for a moment that I understood the educational machinery one-tenth as well as our Head Inspectors, and many of our Inspectors and officers here; but I think that I am capable myself, still more, many of the members of the Board, much superior to myself in understanding, of coming to a right decision with respect to any question likely to arise after consulting our various officers.

23603. Do the Commissioners as a body read and see the reports that the Inspectors send up to the office?—I think very seldom. The annual reports are published, and they can see them.

23604. But not as to the practical working from week to week?—No.

23605. May not the Chiefs of Inspection with the Secretaries and yourself be the only parties really practically acquainted with what is going on throughout the country in connection with the system?—I think there are several of the Commissioners who know a great deal of the practical working of the system—not near so much as the Secretaries do, and the Chiefs of Inspection, and even as myself.

23606. I presume that the statement of Mr. Cross in 1854 applies to the Secretaries and the Commissioners at the present day. He said, "I take the responsibility with regard to any reports laid before me, determining whether they should be submitted to the Board or not. It would be impossible for the Commissioners to deal with the many thousands of reports which are sent in," and so on?—There is a great deal of truth in that. If there is any report that involves anything of importance or difficulty, the Secretary would of course bring it to me, and I would bring it before the Commissioners if I thought it required to be considered by them.

23607. Mr. Cross at that time, as an experienced officer of the Commission, was very strongly in favour of a smaller Board you are aware—have you any idea why he was?—I don't remember at the present moment that he was. It is always to be remembered that Mr. Cross was a great friend and supporter of Archbishop Whately's views, and at the time that examination took place was exceedingly anxious to show that the Board had acted wrongly in opposing the views of Archbishop Whately.

23608. I believe you do not concur in the opinion of Mr. Cross that a large Board, not nearly so large as the present, should give place to a smaller and more responsible one, and that the system could in that case be carried out with greater despatch, uniformity, and vigour?—I don't think I ever expressed an opinion to that effect.

23609. That was the opinion of Mr. Cross in which I presume you do not concur?—I don't think I ever agreed to anything of that sort.

23610. Mr. Cross was an efficient officer, and acknowledged to be such, and well acquainted with the system?—Well acquainted with the system, certainly.

23611. Now, with regard to the administration of the system, what is the present Board proposed to do in administering the system as a Board?—Wherever an officer is to be chosen—any Inspector to be chosen, or Head Inspector to be chosen, or advances to take place amongst the officers of the Board, the Commissioners are always consulted, and often take an active part; and whenever an important question arises with respect to dismissal or punishment of any officer they are consulted, and take an active part in the business.

23612. We may understand then that practically the system, so far as the Commissioners are concerned, is administered by yourself and Secretaries, and Chief of Inspection?—That the routine administration of the system is carried on in that way, but whenever, even in that routine administration, anything of importance or of a novel nature takes place, we are always bound to consult the Board, and do so.

23613. Do you recollect that even in 1854 Mr. Cross suggested that the Board would be all the better for fixed rules to guide them in the administration of the system?—I don't recollect that he did. I am sure he must, because I know his great object at that time—I dare say most conscientiously undertaken by him—was to show that the Board had acted very erroneously in removing from their system the book of "Christian Evidences," published by Archbishop Whately.

23614. Are you not aware that his statement took a wide range then that, and referred to the whole system?—I dare say, but I believe the circumstance that led him to that view, was the circumstance I now allude to. I never before that time heard a hint uttered by any person connected with the system, that it would be desirable to diminish the number of the Commissioners. I never heard the slightest hint that it would be desirable to do away with the representative Board, and to have a strictly official Board put in their place, until we ventured to differ with Archbishop Whately on that all important question of entitled religious instruction, or what the Catholics call "grounded" Christianity. Archbishop Whately had introduced a book called his "Christian Evidences" into our schools, and in 1850 as the Catholics came to consider that question, they were to a man of opinion that it was a great mistake so

to have introduced it, and they were totally opposed to anything like a generalised Christianity being introduced into our general teachings in the schools. That was a great question. It was a question that agitated us for a long time, and we came to a decision at length that it was a very unwise thing to have anything like the "Christian Evidences" as a school book here, and we expelled it from our system, and then Archbishop Whately retired.

23613. Would not your statement show that it would be better to have fixed rules on that, and on other branches of the subject, so as to prevent these questions and divisions?—I think it would have been most unfortunate if at the time the Board were required to make the experiment of introducing the "Christian Evidences" into our system, there had been a fixed rule to that effect, and that it would have been impossible for us to alter that rule. It was infinitely better perhaps that years should elapse, for us and the public, to consider that question, and then at length to come to a strong clear decision that the book ought to be removed.

23614. You say you have not heard a great demand for a diminution of the number of the Board. Have you heard any demand for increase?—What I said was that until Archbishop Whately left the Board, and improved of its proceedings, I never heard a hint given that the Board was too numerous, and I never heard a word that the Board ought to be entirely abolished, and some two or three paid Commissioners put in their place, and I am perfectly certain that if such a suggestion had been made by me to the Government, before Archbishop Whately left the Board, Archbishop Whately would have gone at once to the Lord Lieutenant of the day, and said that either he must leave the Board, or that I must be removed from it. This I say with confidence, and after he left the Board there arose all this cry for doing away with the present Board, and placing some two or three paid Commissioners in their place, and that cry arose at first from Archbishop Whately's friends, and then got revived, if you remember, in 1860, and why? because, in 1860 Mr Cardwell, with commendable wisdom and justice, decided that this Board should henceforth consist of not two-thirds Protestants, as up to that time it had, but of an equal number of Protestants and Catholics. As soon as that act was decided upon by the Government, from that moment the Protestants of the north of Ireland called out for a paid body.

23615. A witness on a former day referred to a rumour that a new officer was about to be appointed in connection with the Board?—I know nothing of him beyond this, that I am exceedingly anxious that such a person should be appointed, and I believe you have, in the very masterly recommendation drawn up by one of the wisest men in Ireland—Judge Longfield—a recommendation to that effect.

23616. Have you heard a rumour to the effect that some persons propose it desirable to have a second paid Commissioner?—Yes.

23617. Is there any party in view specially?—Not that I am aware of. I have a party in view that I think the best now in Ireland for it, and if you wish so I will name him. I don't think it very desirable to be cross-examined on the point, but I am ready to tell any whole mind on that and everything else if you wish.

23618. What is the principle operating on your mind with regard to such a selection?—I think it exceedingly desirable that there should be a second paid Commissioner, now that the business of the Board is so very largely increased, indeed it has very nearly quadrupled since I was appointed. I think in choosing that second paid Commissioner, the chief object ought to be to select the best man you can, on point of fitness for the office; and in judging of that fitness, I do think it is of great importance to consider whether he is a Protestant or a Catholic; for inasmuch as one paid Commissioner is already a Protestant, it would be well to have the second paid Commissioner, if thoroughly fit for the situation, a Catholic; the more

so because I know that when I was appointed, Lord John Russell had written to this effect to the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Portersburg—"That if a colleague was appointed to me, that colleague ought to be a Catholic." That letter you can get by calling for it at the Castle. It was written in 1839. It was a very important document.

23619. Do you think this duality either of paid Commissioners or of officers ought to be?—If I were legislating in the Republic of Plato, I don't say I should be opposed to the principle of duality; but legislating in this country, I think it exceedingly wise in general to legislate in that spirit.

23620. Do you not think it desirable that if you had a second paid Commissioner to represent a religious denomination, there should be a third to represent another religious denomination?—I should be too happy to see it, if the Treasury did not object to a multiplication of officers. I should be too happy to see it, if I could find the possibility of trimming the boat under these circumstances. If I could see the possibility of having a paid Commissioner a Protestant of the Church of England, a paid Commissioner who was a Presbyterian, and a paid Commissioner who was a Catholic—if I could see these three appointed, and the country not protesting against it, as being outraged by such an arrangement—I should not find any difficulty about having even three. I am sure of that, however, that if you appointed, as would be a fair thing, probably, if you regard anything like proportion of numbers, two paid Commissioners Catholics, and one Protestant, almost every Protestant in the North of Ireland would look on himself as greatly injured by such an arrangement. Still more, if the arrangement was one Roman Catholic and two Protestants, one of whom should be a Presbyterian, and the other a Church of England man, I am sure the Roman Catholics of Ireland, who form four-fifths of the population, and whose children from 738,000 out of 913,000 in our schools, would feel themselves infinitely more outraged by such an arrangement, and with infinitely more reason.

23621. With this principle in view, would not the appointment of one for each of the three denominations be a useful change? In other words, don't you find the Presbyterian and Episcopal Commissioners as often divided in opinion as the Roman Catholic and Protestant Commissioners on this Board?—I don't think there is any need of three. If you could have those without outraging the feelings of the people in a very important manner I see no objection to it.

23622. What answer do you give to the first part of the last question (question repeated)?—I think it might be fair if the Treasury approved of it, and the country approved of it, which is much more important. I think it desirable, in a certain sense, to have three, of whom one should be Roman Catholic, and two Protestants; but I am sure the country would entirely object to such an arrangement, and never would assent to it.

23623. As a matter of fact, do you find the Protestant—using that in the general sense of the term, the Protestant element of the Board—differing consistently from the Catholic element of the Board in opinion as to the administration of the system?—I think there is a great deal of harmony between the two.

23624. And do you not sometimes find the Presbyterian and Episcopal members of the Board opposed to each other in opinion also?—Very little—not much; on some occasions they do differ.

23625. Would not the result of such an arrangement be the appointment of a paid Board of Commissioners?—That is, supposing there were three paid Commissioners.

23626. Yes?—I say nothing of the sort, but, on the contrary, I should think the representative Board would even then be necessary. I think it exceedingly desirable—may, absolutely indispensable that the representative Board should continue, because if there was

Feb. 12, 1868.

Right Hon.  
Alexander Macdonell.

264. 12, 1869

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

only one of the three paid Commissioners who were governing the education of the country, a Roman Catholic, it would be absolutely necessary to have a representative Board, to see that justice was done to the Roman Catholics.

25639. With fixed rules guiding the parties in administering the system, how would injustice be done to any body in the case?—We have fixed rules, but three fixed rules are rules that are not stereotyped, and may be, as they have been, altered from time to time. If you wish to know why it is impossible as present to have a fixed code that would remain unaltered, I tell you I never recollect a time when there was less of definitiveness in the system than there has been during the last eight years. A series of changes; in my opinion, most salutary changes, have taken place within the last eight years, and instead of the system having arrived at a definitive shape, it is still, as I told you in a former commission, in its infancy. It has not reached its maturity by any means. It is still in a state of development and growth.

25640. What do you suppose the definitive shape to be?—I am not a prophet. I cannot tell that. All I know is that there is one inalienable principle that never has been altered, and never can be, and that is, that every school should be open to Christians of every denomination, without the possibility of proscription; with every facility for separate religious education; with every facility for united education that the people can avail themselves of.

25641. May I ask what you aim at as the definitive shape in connection with which you think it is desirable to retain this large Board?—I am not able to tell you that, I have not the means of giving an answer to such a question. All I know is that there are a great number of changes, which in the course of time I have no doubt will be adopted with regard to the changing circumstances of Ireland. But we must never violate the great fundamental principle to be altered at all in future times any more than in past time.

25642. In the early history of the Board, were all the Commissioners resident in or near Dublin?—I think every one of them resided in or near Dublin.

25643. Master Brooke.—The Duke of Leinster was a Commissioner?—He resided near Dublin.

25644. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you not regard it still as a decided advantage to have the Commissioners resident in or near Dublin?—Quite the reverse. I hold it is of great importance that many of the Commissioners should be connected with other parts of Ireland, and in that way I should be able to know what were the interests and feelings and opinions of people in every part of Ireland, and of every class—always requiring that there should be a sufficient number of Commissioners resident in Dublin to carry on the business of the Board from time to time.

25645. Did you not regard it as an advantage to have the Commissioners resident in Dublin—at a certain period yourself as a member of the Board—in your evidence?—I forget such a point as that. It is very possible, sir, that twenty years ago I might have said it was a great advantage to have them resident, but if the question had been asked if there should be an addition made to the number of Commissioners you have now, and who are resident in Dublin, and would you think it desirable to have men appointed who do not reside in Dublin, but who are connected by property, religion, or personal interest with other parts of Ireland, I should not have been such a fool as to have said it was not desirable.

25646. In 1834 you acknowledge that even the Commissioners of that day—much fewer in number—were not familiar with their own signatures and sets as a body?—I have not the slightest recollection of saying such a thing. I am sure if I said such a thing it would be incorrect.

25647. Much more—may we not expect the same now, the Board being so much larger and many of the members living at considerable distances from headquarters?—A larger number reside in Dublin now than resided in it at that time. There is a larger pro-

portion of them who know everything connected with our system now than there was then; but I take for granted there are some members belonging to the Board who, not residing in Dublin, have not that intimate knowledge of our minutes or daily proceedings that the seven who belonged to the Board at that time might have had.

25648. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Have you considered what would be the consequence of the proposal which has been made from the liberal side of the House, and which was also taken up by the Duke of Marlborough and the late Government, of appointing a Secretary of State for Education?—I have never considered it. I certainly consider it very undesirable that there should be one Minister of Education in England who should have the entire management not only of the English education but also of the education of Ireland. I think it would be extremely difficult to get any person who would be able to so clearly understand everything connected with Ireland and Irish education that he would be able to exercise an adequate control over everything relating to this Board and education in Ireland.

25649. In that case would not this be the probable distribution of duties?—I had the Minister of Education would be responsible for the whole empire, and there would be some permanent Under Secretary who would be answerable for the Irish branch of the work, as well as one for England and one for Scotland?—I have never considered the question sufficiently to be able to give a decided answer.

25650. But if the House of Commons determined to have these things brought more directly before them—that seems to be the way in which it will eventually come—in that case would you still think it necessary to retain the consultative Board here as advising the administration?—I am sure it would be highly desirable. I can see no objection to having an Under Secretary under a Minister of Education in England—an Under Secretary who should reside in Ireland—who should take a constant part in the proceedings of the Board here, and should have an opportunity of consulting twenty Commissioners here. I think it would be a very fatal step if the Board were to be done away with and the whole supreme direction of education in Ireland were handed over to any Under Secretary.

25641. In the case which I suppose you would be the Under Secretary?—I should in that case immediately resign. I am now seventy-three years of age. It is wholly out of the question my thinking of such an appointment. Some first-rate man in the prime of life should be appointed to the office; he would require a very vigorous mind indeed, and very great powers to perform the duties well. If such a man were sent over I should of course resign immediately. Such a man as that with the admirable staff of Secretaries and Chiefs of Inspection and Head Inspectors we have here, and with this Board of twenty persons drawn from every religion and every class of society to consult with either weekly, fortnightly, or monthly, could, I conceive, govern the education of Ireland satisfactorily.

25642. If such a change were to come, should you consider that such an Under Secretary should be permanent, or should be a political or parliamentary Under Secretary?—I think it would be better, on the whole, he should be permanent, and of permanent, non-political. I think it would be unnecessary that that gentleman should sit in Parliament, because I conceive that being here acting as Under Secretary, and being acquainted with every matter of importance going on from day to day, he would immediately inform his chief, the Minister of Public Instruction, on everything important that would come before Parliament connected with public instruction in Ireland. He would be far more available for that purpose than if a political character, and that he had to leave the business here for half the year and live in London. Besides which, it would be very important that he should feel that he should be a person who would know his duty was to be Under Secretary here, and that he should

devote his whole mind and heart to the business of education, and think very little about politics.

23643. If such an office should ever be created it would dispose of the question whether there should be a permanent paid Board, for the Under Secretary would take the responsibility, and occupy a post equivalent to that of Resident Commissioner now.—I think that would do. I think that if an extremely able, and especially a young man not over forty at most, were appointed to the situation, and that he had under him persons who are thoroughly acquainted with business, the Secretaries, the Chiefs of Inspection, and the Head Inspectors—I think he would be able to carry on the business of education in Ireland without any second paid Commissioner.

23644. Now, in the interim, with respect to the questions brought before the Board, you have told us that the patronage is in the hands of the general Board of Commissioners.—The patronage has always been exercised by the Board itself. The Government, both Conservative and Liberal, have never in a single instance interfered with our distribution of the great number of places under us. About 260,000 a year is expended by the Board in the payment of various officers, endowments altogether of the teachers, and to see you of these situations the Board directly appoints. And what it would be extremely desirable for your Commission to inquire into, would be to know whether during the thirty-six years that this Board has lasted there has been a single instance of even a suspicion of a job in the appointment of a single officer. It is notorious that the Commissioners, with hardly a single exception, have never appointed a person in the most distant way connected with themselves, and I doubt very much whether there is any office in England, in Scotland, or in Europe, where anything could be mentioned more creditable to an office than this circumstance.

23645. Next to the question of patronage comes the dismissal of officers—is that always referred to the Board at large?—The question of dismissal of teachers comes first before the Sub-Committee, and the Sub-Committee report to the Board that such a person ought to be dismissed. If there is any doubt as to their merit, at all with regard to the propriety of dismissing him, the case is brought fully before the Board.

23646. In the record of proceedings always read at the Board, or does it merely be there for consultation?—Merely for consultation and the general result mentioned, that such a dismissal has taken place. But whenever there is any case of importance, any case where a reasonable man could have any doubt of the propriety of the dismissal, we should always bring it forward, and one of the most important duties we have to perform here in the Board is to deal with cases of the dismissal of Inspectors or teachers.

23647. Although both the appointment and dismissal of officers refer in fact to the organization of the office and the working?—Yes.

23648. The Clerks—Who dismiss the clerks?—The Board.

23649. Would the Sub-Committee?—No, we should never venture upon such a thing as the dismissal of a clerk or an Inspector. Whenever there is the slightest thought of dismissing an Inspector, the case is brought forward before the Board, and an inquiry held into it, generally by a Head Inspector, or by a Head Inspector, assisted by an Inspector. The whole of the evidence is taken down with great care, and the entire case is laid before the Board. There it is we have a great advantage in having some of the ablest judges in Ireland as Commissioners. They take a great deal of care in judging of these cases, just as much as if they occurred in their own courts.

23650. The Rule of Insurance.—Is it not the fact that in many cases they take the reports home with them?—Constantly.

23651. And not merely from their judgment upon them at the Board?—That is so. Whenever there is anything of importance or difficulty we get such a man as Judge Langford, or Judge Fitzgerald, or Lord Chancellor O'Hagan, or the Ex-Chancellor Bessy to read

over the evidence. Mr. Bessy took a most active part in such inquiries.

23652. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Looking back, can you say generally whether the recommendations of the Sub-Committee for the dismissal of officers have often been reversed by the Board?—I think very seldom. The Sub-Committee never ventured to recommend dismissal or non-dismissal in the case of officers like clerks in the office or Inspectors. They leave that entirely to the Board.

23653. In such a case the officer would be suspended pending the consideration of the Board?—Yes, for anything serious.

23654. The only other questions that can come before the Board seem to be matters of principle in the administration of the system?—Questions very often arise about the construction of a rule.

23655. Exactly. That would be a question of constraining the law under which you act?—Yes.

23656. Now, supposing a code of instructions were drawn up like the Medical Code in England, and laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament, and that no alterations should be made in it without a full consultation of the Board—the result of these consultations being approved of by the Lord Lieutenant, and also laid on the table of the Houses for a month before they could be acted upon, as in the case of the "Revised Code," do you think such a system would work?—that your system has arrived at such a state of maturity that it will bear the application of that strict rule to it?—All I know is, that the system has not at all arrived at its maturity. I think such a thing could be done now with more comparative safety than it could have been done twenty years ago; but I do not think that even now it would be desirable, to have the system reduced to a strict code such as you mention, and which could not be altered without the intervention of Parliament itself.

23657. Just to correct a phrase. It is not the intervention of Parliament, because it is a sort of tacit consent that is given. A minute of the Committee of Council in England having been on the table of the House of Lords or of the House of Commons for a month, and not challenged by any member, may be acted upon?—If it is not to be matter of constant discussion in Parliament—if it is to be laid to that way before Parliament, I don't think there would be objection to it.

23658. Would it not give a great security? For example, you sometime ago altered the rule about religious instruction, or at least the instruction part upon it has been very much discussed?—No doubt.

23659. Was that thoroughly well known, and open to challenge from any person interested in the question of Irish Education in the House of Commons before it was done?—I don't think the thing was generally known in Parliament.

23660. Would it not be an advantage that before you make any alteration of that kind, one especially that would provide discussion, that there should be an opportunity for everyone to challenge it, and the Minister in Parliament should answer for you Board, and say—the reasons for this alteration are so and so? Then it would be known to the public, and it would come before them with much greater ease, and the change would be made more satisfactory to the public?—I think in that case nothing but good could have arisen from its being laid before Parliament, that such a change had been proposed by the Board here; for I am sure as soon as it was laid before Parliament there would have been an immense majority for the change, and the opposition to it in the North of Ireland would at once have been put down.

23661. Would there not have been this additional advantage, that people generally are willing to submit to what Parliament has approved of, but are not willing to submit to alterations made by what they call an irresponsible Board, or at any rate, though they most submit, they do it unwillingly?—I think it would give in most cases a considerable additional sanction to our rules if any change of rule took place

Feb. 12, 1868.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

Jan. 12, 1868, in that manner. It might be said on the other hand, that this Board being a permanent Board, and though representing the general feeling of the country, not representing at all its fluctuating opinions, there might be a greater security for the just administration of the system if it was left entirely to this Board, than if submitted to the House of Commons, which changes in its composition, sometimes Conservative, and sometimes Radical. I have no fear of that sort myself, but that is the view would be taken by many people.

23662. But the confidence you have in the decisions of the Board in such matters would rather lead you to think that if their reasons were expressed by some able exponent of the system in the House of Commons to anyone who objected, probably the public would be better informed of the reasons for the change, and it would pass more smoothly.—No doubt—and I am not aware of a single change that has taken place in the National system, that if it had been brought before the House of Commons and thoroughly and calmly discussed, would not have been approved of.

23663. Mr. Wallace.—Was not that matter brought before the House of Commons by Sir Hugh, now Lord Cairns?—The question he brought forward was a very important one. It related to the number of monitors. We have 3,300 monitors. We had at first only two classes—junior and senior. We added, in 1866, I think, another class, which we called "first class monitors," consisting of 150. The monitors generally cease their monitorial life at seventeen. We found we had a great many of the best of them in consequence of their being too young to be accepted as teachers. It then struck us that it would be a great improvement to the monitorial system—upon which the whole success of our system depends—if we could bridge over that gap, and that we appointed another class, called the first class monitors, who should consist of the very best of the 3,300 monitors, and should be continued for two years as first class monitors at payments rising from £15 to £17 a year. That was one of the wisest things ever done by the Board. It was opposed most vigorously by nearly the whole of the Protestants of the North of Ireland. They sent over a deputation to Parliament to resist it. Sir Hugh Cairns took a very active part in trying to fix blame upon the Board for venturing to do this.

23664. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—On what ground may I ask?—The ground, I believe, was this, that it was considered to be a mere trick of the Board here, in order to have the greater number of these increased monitorships given to convent schools. It was well known that the convent schools, being 140 in number, having most excellent training going on in them, they would have the greater number of first class monitors, which they have. The majority of the 150 we have belong to convent schools, and very properly belong to them. That was the great ground of opposition.

23665. The fact that this was brought forward in Parliament, and discussed there, did that aid you in carrying out your plan or not?—I have no doubt it did. The moment it was discussed, and people came to see how thoroughly just it was to have an additional link of our monitorial system, such as I describe—as soon as Parliament decided in our favour—the opposition ceased, and it having been tried over and over again that this would be the destruction of the system, we have never heard a whisper of opposition to it since, so far as I know.

23666. Mr. Wallace.—Was not the question of the change of rule, as to attendance at religious instruction, brought before the Lord Lieutenant by a deputation from the North?—Yes, before Lord Kimberley.

23667. And through the newspapers the public came to know of that change?—Yes.

23668. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Do you call such a question as that the establishing of a new class of monitors, a question of principle or a question of detail?—I think it is a question of detail chiefly. I think it would be a very wretched thing to say that twenty now, selected as we are here, for carrying on the education

of the country, were acting against everything like principle in venturing to appoint that additional small class of monitors.

23669. Then the duties of the Board I make out now are twofold—patronage and dismissal of officers, I call that one, and then the question of altering the rules when any great principle is involved; would you leave any matters of detail below that to the Board?—When anything detailed is at all of a novel nature, or if it is a thing likely to attract public attention, and to appear important to the public, we always feel it is our interest and duty to bring such a case before the Board, but there are not many such cases.

23670. If you bring cases of detail before the Board, is it in order to strengthen your decision?—Very much, and to guard against the possibility of its being supposed that we are anxious to increase our own discretionary power. We feel that for our own security it is part of our duty to bring forward every case of importance.

23671. As a rule is it not better the administrators of a system should be distinctly responsible for the whole of their conduct of the system, and that they should not be able to shelter themselves under the Board?—I think I have never in my life observed any disposition on our part to shelter ourselves by referring cases to the Board. Where I felt that there was any doubt on my own mind, or where I felt that sensible men might doubt with regard to the propriety of the decision of the Sub-Committee, I have always felt the wise thing would be to mention it before the Board. I do not think the performance of our duties has been less at all weakened by the circumstance that the Board might act as a breakwater to us; I don't think we have been actuated by any feeling of that sort, I am sure I have not myself.

23672. Your evidence before the Commission on the question of the constitution of the Board tends to this point—to leave things alone. Is that a fair representation of it?—I should be very favourable to having a second paid Commissioner. In other respects I think the system is working very well, and I am not prepared to recommend any change at all except the one which I have mentioned.

23673. Then with respect to the Board itself, do you think that the present number is the right number?—I should not be at all afraid—supposing the Wesleyans were to become a very numerous body, and to have a great desire to have a representative upon the Board, of course it would then be necessary to have an additional Roman Catholic. I should see no objection at all to having twenty-two Commissioners.

23674. Considering that four-fifths of the people are Roman Catholics, and one-fifth Protestants, why do you say one-half the Board should be Catholic and one-half Protestant?—There has been a feeling always in Ireland that inasmuch as very recently the whole power of the State was in the hands of the Protestants, and only recently that the Catholics were admitted into any considerable part in the government of the country, that it would be perhaps best at first to have the principle of what is called duality adopted. And we are always to remember that though four-fifths of the people are Catholic, the great majority of the educated portion of the community is unopposed still Protestant, and that being the case, I think that for the present the country will perhaps willingly submit to a fair equality in all respects between Protestants and Catholics in the administration of a system like ours.

23675. With respect to the appointment of Inspectors, the Board is restrained very often I suppose from appointing the best man, because they must nominate Roman Catholics to Roman Catholic vacancies, and Protestants to Protestant vacancies?—No doubt every Roman Catholic vacancy must be filled by a Roman Catholic, and every Protestant vacancy by a Protestant.

23676. Does not that rule sometimes tend to prevent the selection of the best man for the office?—There may be many cases in which we could find a

letter than if the rule did not exist, and I look forward with confidence to soon see the time when the whole thing will be thrown open to public competition.

23677 Is it not so now?—No. There is competition between candidates of one religion and between candidates of another. But I trust that very soon the Roman Catholics will become so nearly equal in point of education—in the middle class—to Protestants that we may fairly leave all these things open to public competition between Protestants and Catholics indiscriminately. That time most Roman Catholics think has not yet arrived. If a fair competitive examination were to take place for every situation under the Board between Protestants and Catholics, there would be no fear that justice would be done between them even now. But we must always remember it is only very recently Roman Catholics have enjoyed the blessings of a good education. Their collegiate education is still lamentably below that which we Protestants enjoy. But such is the advantage of having to select the intellectual cream out of 4½ millions as against having to select the intellectual cream of 1,200,000 people that, even now, Catholics would be able to hold their own. In the cases of the clerkships in the office here, which are open to competition for both Protestants and Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholics have, I believe, without exception in the last six cases, one after another, obtained the office.

23678 Did that require any nomination, or was it perfectly free?—A nomination took place.

23679 By the members of the Board?—The members of the Board have five candidates Catholics, and four Protestants, and these are chosen by each party, the Protestants and Catholics, as fairly as they can; each being very anxious, of course, that the vacancy should be filled by one of their own Church. A great deal of care is taken in the selection of the candidates.

23680 They are examined by the Civil Service Commissioners?—Yes.

23681 Lord Chief-Justice—I gather from what you have said that it is your opinion that the present system, which allows of modification or alteration of the rules of the Board, is superior to one which pledges the Board absolutely according to fixed rules?—I do. I think, on the whole, it is better not to have rules entirely fixed.

23682 And that it would not be very possible, even at this moment, to frame any set of rules that would not want alteration at a future day?—I think so.

23683 Is it your opinion that it is very much owing to this system which allows the modification of the rules that education has been able to spread itself so much as it has done of late years, and that if you had been confined to fixed rules there would not have been the same spread of education?—I think if we had been confined to fixed rules from the first, education would not have spread nearly so much as it has done.

23684 You have said you approve of the system which allows a large number of Commissioners from different parts of the country—that you consider a large Board superior to a small Board?—I believe so.

23685 I suppose the Commissioners who live at a distance from Dublin are not in the habit of attending the ordinary routine meetings of the Board?—The members living at a distance don't attend so regularly as the others.

23686 But in case of any proposed alteration of any rule of the Board there would be notice of such alteration or proposal given to every member of the Board?—To every member notice is always given.

23687 And every member would have an opportunity of giving his opinion and voting on the subject?—Quite so.

23688 It follows, you are pretty sure, that by the fact of having a large number of Commissioners you can ascertain the feelings and wishes of the country on the subject?—Yes.

23689 And that you think highly desirable?—Yes, highly desirable.

23690 The *Chairman*.—At the meeting of a large

Board does the Resident Commissioner take the chair, or what is the arrangement made as to who shall preside?—There is no regular chairman. At the time the Board was first established, as your lordship is aware, the Duke of Leinster was appointed by Lord Stanley's well-known letter. But as soon as the Duke of Leinster retired from the Board it was decided that it would be better not to have any chairman.

23691 Is the office of chairman of the day given as matter of compliment to the person highest in rank, or in what manner is the chairmanship arranged?—We have no chairmen at all. Very generally some person of very high rank sits in a particular seat, but he has no particular duty to perform as chairman. The Secretary attends, and the Commissioners sit round the table, and there is no chairman.

23692 Is it the custom to put the Resident Commissioner into the chair?—Never, on the contrary, I always make it a point to have my name, as you will observe, placed last on the list of the Commissioners who attend.

23693 Lord Bishop of Meath.—Is it not the fact that the great mass of the Roman Catholic population, especially the Roman Catholic hierarchy, are at present dissatisfied with the working of the National system?—I have already explained what I think on the subject. I believe that at the present moment the Roman Catholic hierarchy would prefer, on the whole to have a strictly denominational system established to the present united one. I believe that, on the other hand, the great majority of the people of Ireland are extremely well satisfied with the system as it stands. They will not oppose their clergy in this matter, but I believe that the vast majority of them think this system is the greatest blessing that has ever been conferred upon Ireland by the English Government.

23694 Then the objections raised by the hierarchy and those who agree with them are objections against the system and not against the way in which the system is worked?—I believe, as I said on a former occasion, that if you were to call any of the Roman Catholic bishops before you and ask them whether, assuming that the present principle of the Board was to be continued—that of united education as opposed to denominational—they would prefer a paid State Board or the present Board to govern the system of education, I believe they would infinitely prefer the present Board.

23695 Supposing changes were made in the system itself so as to accommodate it more to the wishes of those objecting, would any corresponding changes be necessary in the constitution of the Board?—Supposing there was established a denominational system which would give exclusive education to the Catholics of Ireland, and a denominational system that would give a like education to the Protestants, I take it for granted that, in that event, the present Board must be abolished at once, and that the persons to administer each of these two denominational systems would be either a Board consisting exclusively of Protestants and another Board consisting exclusively of Catholics, or a State Board to administer both.

23696 So that the abolition of the present constitution of the Board is based upon the assumption that the existing principle of National education is to be maintained in its integrity?—Quite so.

23697 Sir Robert Kane.—You mentioned that you thought the establishment of a denominational system of education in this country would necessarily involve the abolition of the National Board for the administration of the system as it now exists?—Certainly.

23698 On what ground have you formed that opinion?—Supposing there was a denominational system for the education of Catholics, and another denominational system for the education of Protestants, it would be impossible to have a Board for the administration of the two systems, consisting half of Protestants and half of Catholics. I take for granted that men like myself, utterly opposed to the denominational system, who consider that denominational education would turn the country into two hostile camps with regard to education, and make them into

Feb. 12, 1898.

—  
Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

Feb. 12, 1909.  
 Night Hon.  
 Alexander  
 Macdonnell.

each other much more than they have ever done before—could not take part in the administration of such a system for a moment. I take for granted that almost all the Protestant members and all the Catholic members would object to administer the one a strictly Catholic system, and the other a strictly Protestant system, of education.

23705. Then, your opinion is based upon your belief that the existing members of the Board, being persons friendly to the system of united education, would not feel themselves competent to take part in the administration of a system based on the denominational principle?—I don't think they could.

23706. But it was not anything connected with the present administration of the system you referred to?—It seems to me unnecessary to suppose that a Board like ours, consisting of ten Protestant gentlemen and ten Catholic gentlemen, could administer a strictly Catholic and a strictly Protestant denominational system.

23707. You would compare it somewhat, I presume, to a change of Government—that when a new system was adopted it should be administered by persons who believed it was the best system?—Of course. The Catholic denominational system, I take for granted, if it be governed by a Board like this, would be placed in the hands of a Board of ten or twenty Catholic gentlemen to administer, and the Protestant system in the same way in the hands of ten or twenty Protestant gentlemen.

23708. Two Boards would be required?—No doubt.

23709. Do you think the different sections of Protestants would not together to carry out such a system in one Board?—I think it is extremely likely you would find that the Protestants would differ very much in that respect, that they would not approve of one mixed Protestant Board carrying on the whole of Protestant education of the country; and you are always to remember that, while there actually would be one Catholic Board, and another Protestant Board at the very least, and possibly three Protestant Boards in the administration of the Protestant education of the country, there would also be another and most important Board—which is not to be forgotten—namely, a Board consisting of persons who would administer those schools which would still adhere conscientiously to the mixed system. There would be a very large number of people still who would conscientiously prefer our present mixed system to any denominational system; and it would be most unjust to deprive them of the liberty they now possess of having united education.

23710. Am I to understand it is your opinion that even if the denominational system were established by the State, that these would still be found in the country a certain proportion of people who would persist in preferring the united form of education to the denominational, and who would ask the Government to leave certain schools where united education would still be carried out?—To be sure. I believe there is a vast number of intelligent people in the country who, if the system of denominational education were established, would demand that, as matters justice, they should be allowed to carry on their schools as before, upon the united principle.

23711. Then you would look forward in case of the establishment of the denominational system to the constitution of four Government Boards to carry out respectively the Roman Catholic system, the Anglican Protestant system, the Presbyterian Protestant system, and the united system of education?—I don't see what else could happen. Instead of having a Board like our present Board, they might, some, or all of them, prefer having paid Commissioners—paid either by their own Churches or by the State. I don't suppose the State would tolerate such a thing as paying some twelve or fifteen Commissioners for that purpose. It is very likely they would leave the administration of each of these denominational systems to each of the Churches.

23712. Rev. Mr. Cross.—Is any such arrangement necessary for carrying out the denominational plan in

England or Scotland?—I don't think you have the same sort of denominational system there that people are calling for here.

23713. Sir Robert Knapp.—Do you not think it likely that an attempt at the organization of denominational education with such a many-headed system of Boards as you have described, would be likely to end very soon in the absorption of all the administration in the hands of the Government, and the management of education being placed under one responsible governmental hand, as it is in England?—I think the thing would be attended by such difficulties of such Church had a separate Board for the administration of its own denominational system, that in the end it is very likely the Government would absorb the whole of the education of the country into its own hands.

23714. Would you consider that on public grounds and in the interests of education desirable?—I would not.

23715. Are you aware that some witnesses who have appeared before the Commission, have stated as an objection to the present constitution of the Board, that it is too easily influenced by external pressure, and that its decisions as to its rules are frequently made on insufficient grounds, and without due consideration?—I am not aware that evidence to that effect has been given, but I have no doubt that a great number of people think our rules have been changed too readily, and often changed for the worse. I say this, however, that I do not know a single change that has taken place in our rules from first to last, that can be said to have been carried without full consideration, and hardly a single change has taken place, that the public have not fully sanctioned in the end. It would be very important to produce cases where the rules have been changed, and the public have given a verdict against that change. I don't believe in a single case, we ever made an alteration of rules, that upon the whole was not in the end approved by the public. There were some declarations as to what the rules of the Board were which we thought it wise after full experience to alter. But in the end, and as the system now stands, I should like to have a single case brought forward where a rule of the Board has been unreasonably made, or a single declaration of the Board that has not been approved of ultimately. It is a very strong thing to say, but I am not aware that any great measure or any change of rule has been adopted which has not turned out to have been well considered and beneficial to the public.

23716. Would it not then strengthen the position of the Board, and tend to create more public confidence in its decisions, if proposed changes in its rules were advertised as it were for a month, by being laid before the Houses of Parliament, before coming into operation?—I answered a question to that effect from the Rev. Mr. Cowie, that I could see no objection.

23717. Would it not be quite consistent with the present constitution of the Board, and with the present mode of transacting the business of the Board, to allow such a regulation, after having been adopted by the Board, to be sent forward for the consideration of Parliament, by laying it on the tables of the House before it would come into operation?—It is possible such a course would be desirable. I am, however, sure it would have prevented us in many instances from adopting wholesale changes of minor importance that took place, and improved the system day by day very much. It would be, I think, very difficult to draw the line between changes which are fundamental and those which are matters of detail.

23718. If the change of rules to be laid on the table of the Houses of Parliament before coming into action not to be limited to changes involving the principle of the system of education or making serious changes in its general nature, but not affecting matters of administrative detail, do you think there would be any practical difficulty in applying such a principle?—We are bound to make no change in a fundamental rule of the Board without consulting the Executive. That is our rule, and I can see no valid objection to giving



Feb 22, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

the questioning power to Parliament instead of the Executive.

23713. A delay of a month in bringing an important change into action wouldn't be likely to make a serious difference in the final result?—No.

23714. *Master Brooke*.—Suppose what is called the denominational system should take this shape, that the Board of Education should have nothing to do with religion, distinctly repudiating interference with religion, leaving that altogether to the patrons of the schools, the Board concerning itself only with securing the giving of a good secular education, would not that arrangement entirely remove the difficulty you have suggested of a variety of Boards?—It would get rid of that difficulty, but lead us in a thousand other difficulties. It involves the whole question, whether the Government were right in establishing for the poor of Ireland a system of united as opposed to denominational education.

23715. But all your troubles have arisen out of the restrictive rules?—All our troubles, and all the good we have effected for the country.

23716. Do you think the schools in general are not denominational schools?—Certainly. There is not a school from the Cove of Cork to the Quay of Derry, of the 4,600 schools which we have, which is not strictly a non-sectarian school.

23717. Nominally?—Not only nominally, but really from one end of Ireland to the other. Amongst the whole of these 4,600 schools, there is not a word said, as a thing done, from ten o'clock in the morning till three o'clock in the day, during the time of secular instruction, that gives offence to any Christian of any denomination, and in every one of them the books of the Board inculcate non-sectarian and Christian feelings.

23718. Are you aware that nearly every Roman Catholic clergyman examined before us, including two bishops and two canons, have said that they hold to the schools of the Board, because they are practically in their hands denominational?—Practically in this way, that they have in a great many of their schools now but Catholics attending them, from the physical circumstances of the country, and also, because in every one of these schools, while not a word of sectarian teaching can take place during secular instruction, in every one of them religious instruction agreeable to the consciences of the children, and of the pastor, is carried on daily, so that in reality the beauty of our system is that it carries in a most remarkable manner the advantages of the denominational system, with the great advantages of the united and non-sectarian system. It is strictly secular in one way, as much so as if the secular system was established, in other words, that during four or five hours a day, nothing but secular instruction is given. It is intensely religious so far as the systematic religious education of the people is concerned, because in every school in Ireland almost, Protestant and Catholic, religious instruction takes place daily. In the North, scriptural instruction takes place in every one of the 800 Presbyterian schools, and Roman Catholic instruction is given in the Roman Catholic schools, so that in reality the system combines in the happiest way, all the advantages of the strictly religious, and the strictly secular system of education.

23719. Do you think the great object of promoting united education is answered by a state of things in which the great majority of the Roman Catholic schools have only Roman Catholics, and the great majority of the Protestant schools only Protestants?—I am aware that there is a vast amount of united education taking place in Ireland. Eighty-nine per cent. of the Protestants attending the schools, are in schools attended by Catholics. The amount of united education has risen very nearly to the maximum it is capable of attaining, namely, of having the whole minority attending mixed schools. If the whole minority were to attend mixed schools they could not carry the thing further so far as they are concerned.

23720. That would depend a good deal on the figures?—Certainly.

23721. A good deal of evidence before us goes to considerably diminish the result about which I am sure you have satisfied your mind. The practical result with regard to Roman Catholic schools, appears to me, at least from the evidence, to come to this—that the Roman Catholic clergymen were attached to the system, because they found it, and made it practically denominational, and some went so far as to say that they would not continue in connexion with it, were it not that they found it practically denominational. That being the case within the circle of their experience, I was asking you whether that was exactly reconcilable with your assertion just now, that you had attained to the highest degree the object that was contemplated by you originally, namely, united education in Ireland?—I think that united education has been carried to a far greater extent than any reasonable man could have expected, and considering the difficulties thrown in its way, I am surprised it has risen to so great a point as it has done.

23722. Have you not, in fact, contributed a good deal towards that very result which several of the clergy said they had attained to, having a practically denominational system, under the name of a united system?—Have you not contributed to that result by, in many cases, sending schools in the immediate vicinity of schools previously in existence in order to enable the clergy to come into connexion with you?—We have. This is a most important point. We have in many cases given grants to schools of one persuasion when National schools in the immediate neighbourhood that were maintained by persons of another persuasion existed. Thus, for example—when the Presbyterians joined us in 1846 there was a vast number of applications from them for schools, the children attending which could have received education in Roman Catholic National schools in their immediate neighbourhood, and a question arose, and was very fully considered, whether it would be wise to refuse National education altogether to the children in these 400 or 500 Presbyterian schools unless they went into existing Roman Catholic schools under the Roman Catholic clergy, or allow them to have separate grants for their own schools, they always being required to prove that the attendance at each of these schools was at least thirty, and that the school was administered according to our rules. We decided that it would be most unwise towards these Presbyterians, most unwise as regarded the true interest of the country, if we said—"You must either take no means of education from us, or attend those Catholic National schools already existing in your districts." I believe there never was a wiser decision come to than was arrived at by the Board on that matter. In the same way a greater change took place of a still more important sort in 1849. At that time we found there was a growing demand on the part of the Established Church children to attend our schools. The radical difficulty of attending our schools was this—they could not conscientiously go in most instances to National schools existing in their several neighbourhoods that were governed by the parish and taught by Catholic teachers, because they could not get religious instruction in these schools, and they had various objections to going to any schools but their own. Their attendance in many towns of the schools in the West, in the middle, and the South of Ireland, did not average more than I believe twenty or fifteen. We saw clearly either those children must be cut off from all the vast advantages of a State system of education, or that we must modify our rules; and the great difficulty of the Roman Catholics with respect to our modification was this, that they have always thought the protection involved in having an average of thirty was almost indispensable for their security. Inasmuch as if the average of thirty was required, then the priest, in almost every case where he had not confidence in the Church of England appoint school, could at once prevent its being taken under the Board, because by so possibility in most cases could the attendance be more than twenty or fifteen. We weighed all these conflicting difficulties. It was one

Feb. 22, 1878.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

of the most difficult questions we ever had to deal with. In particular, I felt that the poor Church of England population in the West, South, and middle of Ireland were losing all the good of education in consequence of not being able to avail themselves conscientiously of our National system, and I induced the Roman Catholic members to yield upon the point. I never can but feel deeply grateful to them for doing so. They allowed us to alter our rule, and from that time the modified grant is given to meet the circumstances of the Protestant population in the three Roman Catholic provinces of Ireland. There are 330,000 Protestants in these Catholic provinces, and I don't think any large proportion of them would possibly ever avail themselves of the various blessings of that State system of education unless that rule was modified. Let every one remember when great alterations are brought, and very naturally, to the unnecessary multiplication, in some cases, of National schools, that Presbyterians of the North never could have availed themselves of our system if we had strictly enforced the rule that no school was to be taken into connexion if near to an old existing National school, and there was no likelihood of the 330,000 Protestants in the West, middle, and South of Ireland availing themselves of the advantages of the system, unless these modified grants were made. I am extremely happy you asked the question, because it enabled me to explain how it is that in both these cases we made grants to smaller schools than we originally contemplated.

23733. I may take the liberty of saying I entirely approve of the wisdom of the proceeding in both cases. But was it not a death blow to the united system?—Quite the contrary, because if we refused grants to the Presbyterians in the first case and the Church of England schools in the other we should have rendered more vicious and inveterate than ever the opposition of Protestants in Ireland to our system. The great thing was to win them round to the system. As soon as they are won round to it, depend upon it they will soon come to see the advantage of the larger school as the neighbourhood giving a far better education than any small school can to the children attending, and that perfectly free from the possibility of proselytism or interference with religious opinions. When they come to find the difference between these schools they will eventually attend the large school. That is the only way to win them. But don't attempt to bring them friendly and judiciously. Win their confidence, and in the meantime give them a far better education. That is the true way to win them over.

23734. You have a Protestant school on one side of the street and a Roman Catholic school at the other side of the street, but do you think that ultimately that arrangement will promote the cause of united education?—At present it does no harm to the Catholics, but good, because it creates a small competition with the Protestant school—with yours, perhaps. You, perhaps, as a Protestant gentleman, give your constant attention to and your money to assist it. You are able with only twenty children attending the school to give a far better training than the poor parent in his poor school of fifty children. Your school will eventually excel the Catholic school if they don't endeavour to keep up to your system of teaching. They are the better, therefore, of that competition, and so also are you enjoying the great advantage of having inspection, cheap books, salary, and a thousand other advantages arising from your availing yourself conscientiously of the State system at present; and eventually I have no doubt that one of the schools will melt into the other, and that you will have one great school carried on upon perfectly fair principles.

23735. Hitherto you had mentioned instances only of conversions of that sort made to Presbyterians, and to members of the Established Church, but I must not be also deaf in the case of Roman Catholics—Just the same. The only difference is this, that we Protestants are startled over various parts of Ireland. Except in Ulster we are scattered. Even in Ulster—Protestant Ulster, as it is called—the majority of the

population are Catholics, by some 30,000 or so. Always remember that.

23736. Do you remember a case at Castlennock, where the Rev. Dr. Sadleir had a large school under your Board, filled with Roman Catholic children. The Roman Catholic clergymen built a school within a stone's throw of his, you took his school into connexion with the Board also, and Dr. Sadleir's school was immediately emptied. That was, I presume, done from a similar motive?—There we took it into connexion, because it was not only a school largely attended—

23737. It was no school at all—it is fast brought into existence, and we find it is attended, not mainly by fifteen or twenty, but probably by eighty or ninety children. Our rules are observed in it. We cannot say to that gentleman, because the Church of England clergymen has a school near to you, you must send all the Catholic children to that school. That is not the way to govern the country. Give the option, and avoid endeavouring to coerce the majority of the people. There we gave grants to both schools. Supposing it to have been a Roman Catholic school that existed there, and that the Rev. Dr. Sadleir could not conscientiously send his children there, and could not get religious instruction given to the children there, and that he established a school himself, which was attended by forty or fifty children, how could we refuse it? No, we could not. We acted with great wisdom in that respect.

23738. You said a little while ago, that you wished to have any case brought forward, which might be a test of the wisdom of the changes of the Board. Now, I wish to ask for some explanation about the changes that took place with regard to the rule of religious instruction. Now, the rule up to 1840—I think that was the year—stood thus?—1840. The junction of the Presbyterians took place in 1840.

23739. Up to that time the rule, as stated in the report of 1838, which is before me, was this:—"The managers are to make an arrangement for having religious instruction given to those who are to receive it at a stated time or times, and in a separate place, so that no children, whose parents or guardians object to their being so, shall be present at it." That was a rigid negative and exclusion of all children from all religious instruction of a different denomination from their own?—They were extremely anxious that the children should not attend such instruction. It is not positively said. It shows there was a great anxiety existed in the Board from the fact that children should not receive religious instruction from a teacher not of the same faith as the parents. There is no doubt about that.

23740. That was still more rigidly expressed in Mr. Kelly's letter in the case of the Temple Meeting-house school, for the same letter—it has been several times before us—which was written in '33, "provided that such children only as are directed by their parents to attend be then allowed to continue in the school, and that all others do then retire"—Certainly. That was quoted in the report of 1839, describing what took place. The Temple Meeting-house case occurred not in that year, but in 1835; and certainly, so far as we can collect the naming of the Board from the letter sent from their office, and not from the actual rules and reports of the Board, we must admit the letter shows that in 1835 the notion of the Board was that no child should be allowed to receive religious instruction which its parents objected to. That was the true meaning of the rule expressed thus:—"So that no children whose parents or guardians object to their being so shall be present at it." I think myself the original view of the Board must have been that no child was to be allowed to receive any religious instruction to which its parents objected. There is equally no doubt that when the junction took place between the Presbyterians and the Board in 1840, it was distinctly understood that nothing farther should be insisted on in such a case, but that there should be no compulsion, directly or indirectly, to get a child to attend. Oddly enough, while they were actually

Feb. 19, 1906.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

recording the fact of that junction taking place upon the principle, as Dr. Wilson well knows, that that was the leading idea that actuated the parties, they mentioned this Temple Meeting-house case, which seems to be quite at variance with the very decision the Board had come to in the Corcoran application, and on the junction of the Presbyterians—I was just then appointed to the Board—I said to Mr. Stoker and the Archbishop, "It seems to me you are quoting a case which is entirely at variance with all that you are doing." They did not agree, however, with what I said, and they said, "You don't understand our rules." That letter states as clearly as can be that in case a child receive religious instruction from a teacher of a different Church to his own, it would be against the rule of the Board.

23731. You have in some measure anticipated what I was coming to. That was the next point I meant to ask you about. When the meeting took place in the presence of Lord Elington, His Excellency was pleased to state—that is the third point he mentioned—I read from page 145 of the report of 1892—that according to the fundamental principles of the system the National schools must be open to everyone, and again, that no children should be required to attend or be present at it, whose parents or guardians disapprove of their doing so—You see that is at variance with the Temple Meeting-house case. The Temple Meeting-house case goes further. It not only says they shall not be required to attend, but they shall not be permitted to attend. All Lord Elington there states is, they shall not be compelled. That was when the Presbyterian junction took place. The Presbyterians submitted entirely to the justice of the rule, that no child should be compelled to attend.

23732. Mr. Stoker—How many ecclesiastics have seats on the Board at present?—Yes, the Rev. Dr. Macal, and the Rev. Dr. Jelliffe, who has been lately appointed.

23733. Is one of these a Presbyterian clergyman, and the other a clergyman of the Established Church?—Yes.

23734. When did the last Roman Catholic ecclesiastical member of the Board leave it?—Dean Meyer was the last member. He died, a member of the Board, in 1894.

23735. Can you say why no new appointment of the same class has been made?—I believe the Roman Catholic clergy are unwilling to take the appointment.

23736. Do you remember what proportion of managers of National schools are priests?—A very large proportion. As nearly as possible two-thirds of the number are Roman Catholic priests. I think we have about 2,500 managers altogether, and I think about two-thirds of them are Roman Catholic priests.

23737. Looking to the large number of managers who are priests, and considering the importance of securing public confidence, do you think it desirable to have Roman Catholic ecclesiastics on the Board?—Knowingly desirable.

23738. Does not Mr. Sturley's letter show that the Government, in constituting the Board, contemplated appointments of that kind?—Quite so.

23739. Is there any objection at the Board to receiving colleagues from the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical body?—On the contrary.

23740. In your opinion, should the action of the Government Board of Education be confined to one class of primary schools?—I think it ought to be confined very much to the primary education of the country, and I know that it would be a very dangerous thing if one were required to take any considerable part in the administration of the middle class education. It is extremely desirable, I think, to avoid that under the present circumstances of Ireland, but equally wise, I think, to encourage in every one of our 4,000 National schools the attendance of the artisan class, and such of the middle class as are anxious to attend. I believe that in no respect are our schools doing more good than in giving education to the wealthier portion, if I may so say, of the humble class.

23741. Regarding educational endowments as public property, might the superintendence of the Government Board be extended to endowed schools for primary education?—I don't think there could be any objection to that. I have never considered the question. I don't see any objection to it.

23742. Would it not be a public advantage that endowed schools for primary education should be inspected by the officers of your Board, whose reports would be confined to similar subjects?—I think it would be very desirable, if the persons who govern those endowed primary schools were anxious for inspection.

23743. Could the action of the Board, as now constituted, be extended to this class of schools without any difficulty?—Yes.

23744. As a matter of public policy, would you not think it desirable that subject of education should be regarded as a whole, rather than be dealt with piecemeal by Parliament or the governing authorities?—I don't understand the subject to give an off-hand opinion upon it.

23745. Looking at the stress to which all endowments are laid, do you think it would be a step of wise public policy to give the administration of endowments to your Board, so far as they are devoted to the promotion of primary education?—I don't see any objection to that.

23746. You have said, that the great majority of the Roman Catholics of this country approve of the National system?—I consider they approve of it in this sense, that they are very happy they are enjoying it. I do not pretend to say that if they had the power they would not prefer some system of a different sort. I have heard Archbishop Murray say distinctly that he did not pretend to say that this was the most perfect system he could conceive, or if he had the power would wish to establish, but that what he would say was this, that it was working admirably well, and that it was the greatest blessing Ireland ever had conferred on her by England.

23747. Is there not one particular class of schools which illustrates more than any other the system which you desire to establish in schools?—I think the model schools are the schools in which a great deal we wish to see established is carried out even now more practically than in the generality of other schools, even where the population is mixed. The model schools at one time exhibited a very fair specimen indeed of united education—that is, about two-thirds of the attendance was Roman Catholic, and one-third Protestant. The Roman Catholic attendance has fallen off very much of late, on account of the opposition offered by the Roman Catholic clergy to the schools. There is still a very tolerable attendance; I think about one-fourth of the attendance to the model schools are Roman Catholic. There the education is better than in the generality of National schools, and there is an ample opportunity not only given but enjoyed of having religious instruction. All these things give to the model schools a great superiority over other schools.

23748. Leaving out of account the few model schools in Dublin, Duncannon, and Trm, which enjoy a kind of temporary toleration, is it not the fact that the attendance of Roman Catholics at the other model schools throughout Ireland is extremely small in proportion to the number of Roman Catholics inhabiting the localities where these model schools are established?—Certainly.

23749. Have you looked at the system under which Government aid is administered to Roman Catholic schools in Great Britain?—I do not clearly understand it.

23750. The Government system there is administered by a Board on which no Roman Catholic ever had a seat, at the same time the Catholic schools are perfectly satisfied with the aid which they receive, and with the form in which that aid is administered. Do you think the same happy result might be attained in Ireland, if a similar system was established here?—If you allow

Feb. 13, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

the managers of all the schools in Ireland to give any religious instruction they please in these schools, and to force it upon the pupils attending, and require nothing from them at all except that they give a certain reasonable amount of secular education, of course I conceive it very possible that a Board consisting exclusively of Catholics, Protestants, or Presbyterians, or a Board which had very little religion at all, might govern such a system as that very well, for they would be excluded from almost all trouble in conducting a really useful system of education. But when you have a system established here for the general good of the country, and that a united system, I think it of extreme impor-

tance that that system should be governed, not by a Board exclusively Protestant or Catholic, but by a Board consisting of Protestants and Catholics both. The Government has, with profound wisdom, decided upon having a united system of education for the people of Ireland, because they know that if they now create a system of denominational schools, nothing but mischief can arise from it. They have decided upon establishing a united system, and have thought it quite necessary, for administering that system, to put it into the hands of, not exclusively a Protestant or Catholic, but a very mixed Board.

[Adjourned.]

## SIXTY-SECOND DAY.—SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1869.

PRESENT.

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, Chairman.

The Right Hon. the Earl of DUNRAVEN, R.P.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACKAY,  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKS, Esq., M.C.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN OWEN, D.D.  
SCOTT NAMMETH SPENCE, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SUMMERS, Esq., M.D.  
LAURENCE WALKER, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C.,  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq.,

} Secretaries.

Feb. 13, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

The Right Hon. ALEXANDER MACDONNELL further examined.

23751. The Chairman.—When the model schools were first established were they established with a view of being places where an additional number of masters and teachers might be trained, or a place where masters of common schools could come and see the operation of the schools under the National system?—Both objects were held in view at the time we established these model schools.

23752. Which object should you say at the present time is that which the Board most desire the model schools to discharge?—The chief object that the Board have in view is to exhibit in these model schools the most perfect way of carrying on popular education in Ireland—to exhibit, at the same time, an admirable specimen of the mixed education of Protestants and Catholics in these schools—to supply a considerable number of persons tolerably well prepared for the first steps in our teaching establishments as teachers of the ordinary National schools, and lastly, we are exceedingly anxious that as many of the teachers in the school district as can should visit these schools and should benefit by seeing the superior mode of teaching which is carried on in them.

23753. What provision do you make to enable teachers of common schools to visit the district model schools?—We don't pay their expenses. They know we are very anxious they should visit these schools and profit by their example, but we do not supply any pecuniary means for their visiting the schools. Generally speaking, these schools are in large towns—in towns in which there are a great number of ordinary schools. For example, I think there must be nearly 100 schools in and around Belfast, all within short walking distances of the excellent model school in that town. The teachers of these schools can take what hour they choose, and I have no doubt do very largely benefit by seeing what is going on in the model schools there.

23754. What opportunity has a teacher who is himself engaged in a school some miles off from the model school of coming, visiting, and attending in the model school?—The model school is generally open on Saturdays. The ordinary National schools are very often closed on Saturdays. They could with very great ease go and see what was going on on Saturdays at all events; and I have no doubt that if the man-

agers of schools were asked by their teachers to give permission to visit the model school in the neighbourhood they would readily and properly give permission to do so.

23755. If the teacher of an ordinary National school comes to a model school to examine its working and profit himself, does he report himself in any way to the managers or teachers of the model school?—No, not necessarily.

23756. Is any notice taken of him by any teacher of the model school?—Not that I am aware of.

23757. Is any record kept when any such persons visit?—No, I don't think there is. It might be very desirable to us to encourage the visiting to the model schools in each neighbourhood constantly. So long, however, as those model schools are disapproved of by the Roman Catholic clergy, I dare say it will be extremely difficult to make any arrangement such as you mention.

23758. Is not the teaching in all model schools, as compared with the number of pupils, very much in excess of the teaching which any ordinary National schoolmaster can expect to give in a school under him?—Generally, and necessarily so, inasmuch as we have two objects. The first is to exhibit a kind of teaching in these model schools far superior to what can be reasonably attained in ordinary National schools; and secondly, we are anxious to train up in the model schools a great number of young men called pupil teachers, not merely to be teachers in the school, but to become teachers in future of ordinary National schools. In Belfast, where, as is well known, we reduced the number of monitors at one time, I believe there is a teacher of some kind—a principal or assistant or pupil teacher, or paid monitor to every sixteen children. That is far greater than we ever can have in our ordinary National schools, but I don't know that it is much more than what it is desirable to have in a model school like that in Belfast, regard being had to the double object of having excellent education given in that school and to training young men to become in future teachers in National schools.

23759. Does it often happen now that teachers of ordinary National schools get promotion to model schools, or is not the tendency rather to promote pupils of model schools to be teachers of model schools

as a separate class?—There is not any rule laid down on the subject. I am sure what ought to be done, in order to work each school perfectly, would be to consider each model school a model school not of a particular town or school district, but a model school of the nation, and to draw the teachers into that model school from the whole of the 8,300 teachers we have, according to their merit, and to have as little regard as possible to anything but downright merit.

33760. When a vacancy takes place in any of these general model schools, is it filled up direct by the Board?—It is filled up by the Board.

33761. On the recommendation of the Inspector?—The Inspector gives his opinion. That is submitted to the Head Inspector who is consulted; then it comes up to the Chiefs of Inspection and myself in sub-committee, and then at last the Board directs who shall be the teacher.

33762. I presume the original recommendation of the Inspector would be limited to persons within his own district of whom he has a knowledge?—Knowing those best he would naturally be governed by that; but the Head Inspector, being at the head of ten districts, he has to look of course to the merit of the teachers in all the ten districts, and the Chiefs of Inspection have known perfectly well the character of all the teachers in Ireland; they have the means of judging very well upon the subject, and they often consult the professors here, who have trained several teachers, upon the test.

33763. After the ordinary Inspector, who has charge of the model schools, has suggested names for any vacant appointment in a model school, does it often happen that the Head Inspector submits other names to the Board also, with the original names so recommended?—They agree together on the subject. Then their recommendation is sent up to the Chiefs of Inspection here, and they consult together with the Secretary, and myself. There is the most perfect impartiality on the subject. But what I should say is that we have to look much more than we have hitherto done to selecting the teachers, both principals and assistants of model schools, not from the teachers of a particular district, but from the great body of 8,300 teachers that are under us.

33764. With regard to the different practicing schools in Marlborough-street, some of which are for a large number of children, and some of which are for a very small number of children, how is it decided into which of these schools applicants for admission are put?—The professors entirely control that matter, the Commissioners themselves don't interfere. I have never heard of any kind of unfairness being shown in the selection of particular schools for the pupils.

33765. At present, I believe in Marlborough-street the masters and the mistresses who are in training, are housed in an establishment in which Roman Catholics and Protestants live jointly?—Quite so, my lord. That has been the practice ever since the establishment of the boarding-house here. Catholics and Protestants have from the first been boarded and lodged together, sleeping in the same dormitories, living at the same table, and teaching during the whole day together, and attending lectures together. There is, however, a certain number of teachers who come to be trained here, who are called extern teachers, persons who do not lodge within the boarding-house of the Commissioners, but who live at their own expense in the town.

33766. To whom do they report themselves, or under whose control are those externs?—I think there is very little control exercised upon them. We are content to know that they attend regularly here, and that their conduct is excellent while here. I don't remember any case of any complaint of misconduct having been before the Board.

33767. If it were more palatable to Roman Catholics that Roman Catholic teachers should reside in boarding-houses by themselves, still taking part in the common instruction, would that, do you consider, interfere with the system of the Board?—I think it would scarcely take any effect upon the efficiency of our

teaching. I am bound to say that, as far as I have known, the mixed life of both Protestant and Catholic teachers here, has been married on with the most perfect harmony and success. I should be very anxious that they should continue not merely to live together and lodge together from morning till night, but even live in the same lodging-house together, because there is nothing in my life less given me so much pleasure as having seen for thirty years Protestants and Catholics from every part of Ireland, of every race, trained in perfect harmony together in our lodging houses. So far as I remember, I have never known a single religious quarrel taking place amongst those Protestant and Catholic teachers, of whom thousands and thousands have been educated together here.

33768. At the same time, however, must we not accept it as a fact that, from whatever reason, the Roman Catholic authorities are becoming more and more adverse to that combined teaching?—That is so. For many years they have become more and more opposed to that combined life, and as soon as we ascertain that that is a settled view upon their part, it appears to me we have nothing for it but to yield like men of sense on the subject—to give every facility for combined and united life here, and allow those who cannot conscientiously avail themselves of that combined domestic life, to live separately as far as the lodging is concerned. If I could see any proof that those persons who do not sleep in the same dormitories are not so well educated and as well fitted to carry on our National schools as those who are I should have every objection to adopt the proposed change, but I am convinced it would not make any serious difference in the mode of carrying on their schools in affairs, to allow such option to the teachers.

33769. The question of comparative efficiency is one that, upon examination, is soon put to a practical test?—Necessarily.

33770. Are you aware that in England there are no training establishments wholly maintained by the State?—I have heard so.

33771. Are you aware that the establishments under which the Roman Catholic teachers are trained, are maintained by that community with partial assistance from the State in England?—I am not aware what the practice exactly is.

33772. If the Roman Catholics, or any section of Protestants, desire to maintain training schools under their own exclusive management, do you think it would be contrary to the work of the National Board that if each of these establishments was examined by the Board's Inspector, they should receive assistance from the Board proportionate to the number of pupils that were in residence, and had passed the proper examination?—I think that what would be entirely in accordance with the principles of our system would be this,—that if there was a training establishment in any part of Ireland—let us take Kerry or Donegal, in which the Catholics desire could not conscientiously avail themselves of the training that takes place in our present training schools—it would be a perfectly legitimate thing, and entirely in accordance with the principles of our system, if we allowed the Roman Catholics to establish a model school consisting of a large number of pupils, taught exactly upon the same principles upon which our National school is taught, with a large number of teachers, assistant-teachers, and pupil-teachers. That school might be partly built, if it were necessary, at the expense of the Board, or if a non-vested school, entirely by the local parties. The house in which the pupil-teachers lodged, should be carried on entirely at the expense of the locality, the State itself confining its assistance and endowments to the model school connected with that boarding-house. I think that if the boarding-house was carried on under exclusive Roman Catholic management and control, and excluded from it all Protestants, that the maintenance of such an institution would be contrary to the general principles of the National Board. What really is desirable, and what I believe would be quite sufficient to satisfy the wishes of

Feb. 15, 1868.

Right Hon.  
Alexander Macdonnell,

Feb. 18, 1868.  
 Right Hon.  
 Alexander Macdonnell.

nearly all the Roman Catholics of Ireland upon this point, would be to have a great model school erected on strictly upon the principles of united education, to have excellent teachers appointed by the managers, and a corps of pupil-teachers appointed according to the number of pupils in attendance, these pupil-teachers to be lodged in a separate building provided, not by the State, but by the particular Church to which they belonged. That is what is proposed in Mr. Fortescue's letter upon the subject. He made a clear distinction between a boarding-house where the domestic life was to be earned on according to the strict principles of the managers, and the National school which should consist of at least 150 pupils in average attendance, and be carried on strictly in accordance with the principles of united education.

23773. In England the National Society, which is the society in communion with the Established Church, has training schools for masters and mistresses at St. Mark's and Hammersmith and Whitelands. The Roman Catholics have colleges at Hammersmith and Liverpool. These have assistance from the State proportionate to the number of pupils whom they pass at each examination. Do you think it would be impracticable to extend that system to Ireland?—I think it would be better not to extend it to that extent. I think in Mr. Fortescue's letter all in done which the circumstances of Ireland require, and imperatively require at present, in order to avoid the National system. I think it would be carried out better not to endow with any fund from the National funds a boarding house which was exclusively intended for the domestic education of a particular sect.

23774. Then, as I understand, your own opinion would be not to go beyond separate boarding-houses?—Separate boarding-houses with model schools connected with them, carried on strictly in accordance with the principles of the National Board. I believe if that were done it would give the most entire satisfaction to the great bulk of the Catholic clergy, and that in a short time we should see a vast increase in the number of trained teachers in Ireland—a great want, and which must be apparent to everyone who knows, that out of 8,300 teachers at present employed in the service of the Board of Education, there are nearly 5,000 utterly untrained.

23775. Lord O'Shaughnessy.—Do you not think it possible the State would assist several religious bodies in maintaining schools, reserving the right to see that the pupils educated in them should pass an examination in separate subjects, of which the Inspector should report satisfactorily?—No, my lord. I think it would be against the principles of the National Board to give a grant to any school for a training establishment that was not freely open to Children of every denomination in Ireland.

23776. Mr. Sullivan.—You would maintain the training establishments for all denominations?—For all denominations.

23777. And endowed by the State?—In the existing central establishment here.

23778. Do you not think that would be an injustice to those who would refuse to send their teachers there that the mixed system should be endowed, and the national system not endowed?—I think it is perfectly fair when a training establishment is open indiscriminately to Children of every denomination, that it should then be endowed.

23779. Am I to understand you as saying that would be really a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, and that it would be accepted by the majority of the Roman Catholics of Ireland?—I think it would. Anything else would certainly be a violation of what I conceive the principles of united education to be.

23780. Lord O'Shaughnessy.—You say that the model schools have a much larger number of pupil-teachers and mistresses in proportion than there are in other schools?—Yes.

23781. Do these pupil-teachers and mistresses ever qualify themselves sufficiently to be able to go straight from the model schools to take charge of common schools?—We find a good number do, and I believe a

person who has gone through monitorships and pupil-teacherships under our Board, is infinitely better suited to be at the head of an ordinary National school than the generality of teachers were twenty years ago.

23782. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You don't regard the model-school system as a new feature of your system?—It has existed more or less from the first.

23783. And it was very early in contemplation?—It was.

23784. Both by the Government of the day, and by the Commissioners who regularly administered the system?—Certainly.

23785. From the first, I believe, as the first volume, page 20, by which I find that the Commissioners had in view the establishment of model schools?—Certainly.

23786. In the report of 1835, they say—"We are of opinion that in addition to the general training institutions, thirty-two district model schools should be established, being a number equal to that of the counties of Ireland; that these model schools should be under the direction of teachers chosen for superior attainments, and receiving superior remuneration to those charged with the general primary schools, and that hither candidates for admission to the training establishments, should undergo a preparatory training in one of them." That seemed to be the primary object?—Yes.

23787. Can you say whether it's the usual course for the Head Inspector to submit the names of parties to be appointed to situations in model schools?—Generally speaking both the Inspector and Head Inspector are consulted upon the appointment of teachers and assistant teachers.

23788. Are many appointments made in that way?—I believe so.

23789. Should you say it's the general rule to appoint more through the professors and others connected with the Marlborough-street institution?—We take all these things into consideration. In every case we are anxious to obtain information with respect to the superior fitness of our teachers from the Professors, Head Inspectors, and Inspectors connected with the particular school, and from our Chiefs of Inspection here.

23790. It has come before this Commission from a representative of the teachers that the teachers in the country consider themselves precluded from any hope of these appointments. Do you regard that as well founded?—I don't think it's well founded. I have no doubt at all that the teachers hitherto, and head masters, have been drawn too much from particular districts. My own opinion has always been this—I have not been able to carry it thoroughly into effect—that these appointments must be considered the great prize for all our best teachers—that they should be open to competition without regard to anything at all but merit, and that instead of their being drawn from particular districts, that the appointments should be open to all our teachers throughout Ireland. I further think that that it is not merely to our 8,300 teachers, but equally due to the particular school itself. Our experience of gaining eminent ability is infinitely increased by having the rewards given amongst our best teachers, instead of being confined to a few in a particular district. At present there are about 180 teachers in model schools; 75 only are Roman Catholics, and the rest are Protestants. That is not a safe state of things.

23791. What is the number of teachers in the model schools?—Altogether nearly 200. The whole number of our teachers being 8,000, of whom five fifths nearly are Catholics; it is not a right position.

23792. Do you think you are correct as to the proportion of Roman Catholic teachers?—I do; they are nearly four-fifths.

23793. Rev. Mr. Cress.—Will not the number of Roman Catholic teachers in model schools continue to diminish under the present prohibition?—Certainly; because most of those in the model schools were in before the prohibition and are not compelled to leave, but the new ones, appointed after the prohibition, are under very strict disabilities. I am not aware that the pro-

jection has hitherto prevented any numerous Roman Catholic from accepting the situation; but, I am sure of this, that prohibition must diminish exceedingly the number of non-vested Roman Catholic teachers.

32794. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—But, as a matter of fact, the number of Roman Catholics looking forward to these appointments is not diminished?—I do not think it is.

32795. You always find a sufficient number applying and looking forward to such appointments when vacancies arise?—A considerable number apply. I would wish to foresee that they should be open to competition, and that every non-vested teacher in Ireland, whether Protestant or Catholic, whether coming from the north or from the south, should be able to compete for the vacant situation.

32796. Signification of religious denomination?—Yes.

32797. Should you not consider that a good principle to apply to the whole system?—I have always thought so, as I said yesterday, I look forward to see the time when our inspectorships will be thrown open to competitive examination between Protestant and Catholic. As I said yesterday, there was a very powerful reason why the Roman Catholics could not accede to that plan, inasmuch as we, Protestants, had for centuries monopolized entirely the highest education of the country, and it was only recently Roman Catholics were enabled to get the higher education, but now they will very soon be able to compete successfully with us.

32798. I presume if you had this religious or denominational element more eliminated from the system throughout, it would be better for the Commissioners administering the system?—It would be materially better to eliminate it as much as possible; it never could be eliminated from the governing body, for this reason:—It is impossible for the governing body to administer the system well without knowing the feelings and interests of the three or four leading sects in Ireland, this cannot be known, except by persons substantially representing these several sects.

32799. Be so kind as to explain a little more fully what you mean by conducting the non-vested model schools you have indicated, strictly on the principles of united education?—Supposing the model schools we are now speaking of, which are to be connected with the boarding-houses where the pupil-teachers are to be lodged; that school, whether vested or non-vested, must be carried on exactly as your own ordinary National school is. It must be open to Christians of every denomination. Nothing must be taught there from ten in the morning, when the school begins, until three o'clock, when it closes, that can give offence to any person of any denomination.

32800. So that with regard to education and teaching throughout the day all parties should be admitted without any infringement of their conscientious feelings?—Precisely so.

32801. You have indicated that as Mr. Fortescue's plan to some extent or altogether, may I ask was ever a similar plan submitted to the Commissioners of National Education?—Not that I am aware of. However I think I have long had in my own mind—long before Mr. Fortescue thought of it—that the only way of saving any existing model schools would be—this occurred to me as soon as the Roman Catholics became opposed to the principle of our model schools—to give to those parties who could not conscientiously avail themselves of these model schools, were they Protestants or Catholics, the power of having model schools such as Mr. Fortescue suggests in that paper. If I might be allowed to go a little further, I would say I can conceive nothing that would go farther to attach the Roman Catholic Church to the National system, and confer a great blessing upon the people of Ireland, than to have some thirty or forty such schools. Consider a school of that character established in the county of Donegal or the county of Kerry, or any other county, in which there should be an average of 150 pupils every day, with these great staffs of excellent teachers, with that training house supported entirely at the ex-

pense of the local parties; I believe that in that school would be found a far more efficient education, both for the humblest and the poor artisan class, and the higher rank that are occasionally in model schools, than in any almost that exists at present. I believe it would be found in the walls of Donegal such a school could be established under Bishop McGeigan, in the boarding-house of which there would be fifteen pupils selected from the cleverest lads in his diocese. I have no doubt, a great number of the sons of the leading farmers and shopkeepers, pupils of the school, would reside in that house, and that the fifteen pupil-teachers educated there would be able to get admirable instruction in the evening along with this superior class of pupils. A great benefit would be derived by the pupil-teachers by being brought into connection with the others. Remember always that our teachers are drawn from the peasantry of the country. Though they are exceedingly clever, their ideas and habits are much coarser than those of the persons above them, and that the benefit of being lodged in such a house for two years along with a higher class of pupils, who would be attracted to the model school, would be that at the end of the two years, when they went out to teach, they would be lifted up greatly above the level at which they were when they first entered the training establishment. I believe that in England it has been found necessary to have the pupil-teachers trained for a long time in the training colleges for the express and excellent purpose of giving to these lads of humble birth a higher tone than they otherwise could possibly have.

32802. The Commissioners reserve to themselves the right, I believe, of abridging the annual reports of the Inspectors?—Yes.

32803. Do you not recollect that about the year 1858, our Inspector furnished his annual report containing certain recommendations, which part of that report has not been published, and which recommendations were taken into consideration by the Commissioners?—I do not remember it.

32804. Do you recollect whether a report of Mr. Keenan for 1858 was abridged?—There was a report in one year abridged, the abridgement of which I objected to, and it was mentioned in Parliament that I had objected to this abridgement.

32805. Part of it was expurgated?—Yes.

32806. Were the recommendations similar to this plan of Mr. Fortescue?—I think not, I think the report that I allude to was a report in which he referred to the great extent to which Bible reading had been carried on, on the part of Roman Catholic children in National schools under Protestant managers. I do not recollect our ever having abridged anything in a report of Mr. Keenan's in respect to training-houses such as we are now speaking of.

32807. Will the Secretaries furnish to this Commission a copy of the abridged or omitted part of this report, the minute of the Board upon the subject, and the names of the Commissioners present when it was considered?—No doubt, if you are kind enough to put in writing what particulars you refer to.

32808. Mr. Stowe.—Has that report ever been presented to Parliament in answer to an order of the House of Commons?—I do not think it has ever been asked for. I do not know what particular report Dr. Wilson alludes to.

32809. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—I should like to ask you a question about a subject on which we were yesterday. Suppose an opponent of the present Board were to say, that having on the last persons of considerable position in the country, whose names gave the Board in fact its weight, and also the names of other persons who are not so eminent, but derive their influence from being on the Board, it is not likely that on most occasions your Board would be attended by those who derive importance from being members of the Board, and not so frequently be attended by those who give importance to the Board, and that, therefore, there is a danger that the management should fall into the hands of a clique?—

Feb 18, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

\* The unpublished portions of Mr. Keenan's Report here referred to will be found in the Appendix to Evidence, No. XVIII.

Feb. 18, 1883.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
MacDonnell

I think the danger of its falling into the hands of a clique is not great. We have about ten members who attend pretty regularly here; of these, just about six are Protestants, and four Roman Catholics; of the six Protestants, three are Presbyterians, and the other three are Church of England; the remaining four are Catholics. Of these Catholics there are always about one-half consisting of very competent men. I do not see that there is any fear that the power of the Board will fall into the hands of a clique.

23810. The Earl of Devonport.—Is it not the fact that the members of the Board who attend generally are precisely the men who are most competent in their own positions?—I think the eminent members of the Board attend pretty often. Some of our most eminent members cannot attend very often, for example, the Lord Chief Baron and Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, but this I know, that whenever there is any question of real importance, these gentlemen are always ready to be present, and give us their best judgment and assistance. The great protection against the Board falling into the hands of a clique is, that the ten who attend regularly, consist of persons of the three leading denominations, who differ a good deal in religious opinions and in politics, and with regard to other matters, from one another.

23811. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Does the attendance of those ten members who come regularly arise from their own free choice or from some arrangement made at the Board?—From their own free choice, but that free choice is supplemented a good deal by the circumstance that the Church to which the Commissioner belongs would certainly expect him to take an active part in the administration of the system.

23812. Sir Robert Kane.—In the case of the establishment of denominational residences attached to training schools to which you referred just now, do you consider that after such establishments were in existence, providing for the wants of the several religious communities, that there would still be any sensible proportion of the managers of schools who would wish for teachers trained in institutions of a more united character?—I think so a long time there would be, and very likely there would always continue to be, a very considerable number of persons who having availed themselves of the new model schools under local management would come to our central training establishment to complete their education. It would be a very long time before there could be any considerable number of the new establishments created. I think that the first effect of such establishments would probably be to increase largely the number of Roman Catholics who would come up to be trained in Dublin, because I should expect that the generous treatment of Roman Catholic feeling on the subject would break down in a good degree the strong prejudice that now exists against our model schools, and that a great number of persons who now decline to attend would then avail themselves of our training. I have no notion that there could be for many a long year a great number of such establishments as are contemplated in the Fortunes letter. I should expect that every year the love of united education would become greater and greater as soon as the generous policy of that letter would be carried into effect.

23813. Do you consider that the establishment of such denominational residences, attached to training schools, would be limited to distant localities in the country and would not take place also in Dublin?—I think very likely these might be such even in Dublin, and I can see no harm at all in it.

23814. Then, as part of the carrying out of the arrangement stated in Mr. Fortunes's letter, you would think it possible there might be here in Dublin, under the direction of religious authorities, residences for masters in training, who should get their actual instruction in the central establishment here, but live by themselves in a system of religious discipline?—The Roman Catholic teachers who come up here would, in many cases, I have no doubt, be lodged in religious houses in the town, and I can see no evil in

that. I would rather myself that they continued to live together with their Protestant fellow students in our central establishment; but if they could not conscientiously avail themselves of that, I should be very happy to see religious houses provided by their own Church for them. Supposing in the case of the students of the Queen's College in Cork that, in addition to the advantage which they receive of an excellent education during the whole day in the college, their parents wished them to lodge in houses provided by their respective Churches instead of in common lodging-houses, I can see no objection to that being done.

23815. Are you aware that the statutes of the Queen's College contain a provision for the establishment of small denominational residences under the direction of the authorities of their respective Churches?—I am not aware of it, but I am very happy to hear it. I think it would be a very good thing if there were such establishments.

23816. You would not contemplate in any case—I would gather from a former answer of yours—that any public funds would be given for the support of the denominational residences?—That is part of Mr. Fortunes's plan, that the training-house itself should be built and supported by the local parties. They would, no doubt, have a great advantage in training up fifteen or sixteen pupil-teachers, who would lodge there. They would have probably £20 a year for the support of each pupil-teacher, which is what we always give in the case of our own model schools.

23817. In the arrangements for the residences of pupil-teachers at the present time is there not a sum of £20 a year paid towards the support of these pupil-teachers?—We support altogether the teachers undergoing training in the central establishment. In the district model schools we give £20 a year to each of the pupil-teachers, male and female, as are not accommodated in the district establishment. In the minor model schools there is no residence, and we give to each pupil-teacher £20 a year, which we propose to give also to the class of persons attending model schools under the local management. Whether that £20 is employed by them in paying their expenses at a common lodging-house, or whether it is bestowed by them upon the persons who board and lodge them in a house provided by their parents or others, is a matter of no importance to the State.

23818. Then you would not consider the payment of £20 a year to these few pupil-teachers who would live in denominational lodging-houses as an infringement upon the principle you have stated, of the State not contributing to the support of these houses?—Not in the slightest, any more than if I contributed that £20 a year to the owner of a common lodging-house. I would not consider that was infringing the principle of National education.

23819. That is you would not give £20 a year to the lodging-house, but you would give it to the pupil who would go into the lodging-house?—Yes, and if it appeared that that was more than what the State ought to pay to that pupil for his support then there would be some objection to give that sum to him, but if it is precisely the sum we should give to that pupil if he chose to live in a common lodging-house in preference to such an establishment as that which we now contemplate, I do not consider that such payment would, in the slightest degree, infringe upon the principle of National education.

23820. You would not propose to make any regulation which would force any Roman Catholic pupil-teachers to reside in such denominational lodging-houses?—That question has never arisen. What it does we should deal with it.

23821. What would be your own impression about it?—My own impression would be to give perfect liberty to the teacher to go either to that lodging-house provided by his bishop, or to another, but I am sure of this, there is no pupil-teacher in Ireland of the Roman Catholic persuasion who would not infinitely prefer going into the common training house provided by his Church than going into an ordinary lodging-house.



23432. You mean he would prefer the denominational training-house?—Yes. The advantage would be so great. The pupil-teacher would then be lodging with his fellow pupils. He would have an excellent education, probably both religious and secular, given to him by persons carrying on the establishment, and he would be living with, I believe, a superior class of people, quite independent of the pupil-teachers themselves. I do not believe the theoretical evil you are guarding against would in practice occur. If it did I should be inclined to say, do not compel the young men to go to that house, and I think that would be the general feeling, but I do not believe that one case would occur in a thousand. *Dr witness has now ceased to be.*

23433. You mentioned in reply to a former question that these denominational boarding-houses should be supported at the expense of the locality. Did you mean that in the sense of the members of that denomination in the locality or by any system of assessment?—No assessment at all. It would be utterly contrary to my sense of justice. For example, if I myself had £10,000 a year in a part of Ireland where two or three such establishments existed, I should most liberally contribute, though a Protestant, and perhaps as strong a Protestant as most people, to those establishments. I should consider I was doing a great thing for the majority of my countrymen, and for the Protestants themselves in so doing; but I should altogether object to a compulsory rate for the support of such denominational establishments.

23434. Am I right in supposing that you will consider that if even in Dublin there were organized denominational residences for masters or pupil-teachers who would be trained in the schools here, these denominational residences being under the authorities of the Churches to which the teachers belonged, and in harmony with their ideas, it would still be necessary to completely supply the wants of the country, to preserve the system of united residences such as you now have at Glencree and in George's-street, where persons who do not so clearly see the religious or denominational residences, might be able to live together as they now live in these boarding-houses I have named?—I am decidedly of opinion it would be a most unjust thing to put us and to the present united life that exists for all such teachers, Protestant and Catholic, whose parents wish them to be educated together, and lodging in the same house. I think it would be most unjust to do away with that on the supposition that Protestants as well as Catholics were not anxious for such united life.

23435. I believe it has been already testified by some witnesses, that united life has been carried on in your boarding-houses with harmony, and without any apparent deterioration of religious habits or duties?—I think I stated yesterday, as strongly as I possibly could, that nothing in my life had given me so much pleasure as witnessing for thirty years Protestants and Catholics from every part of Ireland, and every race, coming up to be trained at a time of life when persons and principles are strongest, and living together in perfect harmony, without a single religious quarrel having taken place during these thirty years. That, together with another fact I wish to bring under your notice: during the whole of that time I have seen thousands of children in the schools from five years to sixteen or seventeen years of age, and I have never observed, though constantly moving amongst them during the day in their playgrounds or in the school, a single blow struck by one of those pupils. I maintain that if Burke and Montesquieu were alive at the present moment, and these two facts were brought before them, they would regard them as most remarkable proofs, if true, of the astonishing power of impartial and benevolent government over human creatures. I doubt if there is any country in the world that has ever exhibited anything more remarkable in that way. But, while I say that, God forbid I should prevent fellow-countrymen who conscientiously wish to have a different sort of training provided

for their children,—God forbid I should stand in the way of their wish. It is a conscientious wish, and the result of our opening it is what you see, that out of 8,000 teachers nearly 5,000 are untrained; and no man who knows what the meaning of an untrained teacher is can doubt that it would be an immense blessing if we could in some way or other increase the training power.

23436. If the facilities you have described for training the teachers under a system of residence and religious discipline satisfactory to the Church authorities were carried out, do you think it would be then necessary to continue the employment of absolutely untrained teachers at all?—It would take a long time before we could get rid of untrained teachers. By degrees the teachers would become more and more trained, and in twenty years or so, instead of having nearly 5,000 untrained teachers, as at present, nearly the whole of the teachers will be trained. You must protest by degrees. The evil is a great one. No one who knows the difference between a trained and an untrained teacher is teaching the First and Second Books can doubt that every sort of effort should be made by us, that conscience will admit of, to diminish the number of untrained teachers. We know very well that 45 per cent. of the attendance in the National schools are in the First Book. I believe that learning the alphabet and First Book takes very nearly two years under the common method of teaching. I believe that when the art of teaching and all its appliances are thoroughly understood by trained teachers the length of time taken in mastering the First and most difficult book would probably be diminished by one half. What is the responsibility we undergo if we diminish the number of trained teachers by refusing to consent to such a plan as is now before us? I also must say this, that, supposing the objections to united training proceeded, not from the four millions and a quarter Roman Catholics, but from the one million two hundred and fifty thousand Protestants, the objection to Mr. Fortescue's plan would never be listened to by the Protestants of the empire.

23437. You think then that some of the opposition, perhaps a good deal of the opposition to Mr. Fortescue's plan, organized in its being looked upon as a concession to the Roman Catholic party?—I believe that was the chief objective. It is an objection that not only proceeded from the Protestants, but it proceeded from them because they thought it was unfavourable to united education. That was the main idea they had in their minds.

23438. Rev. Mr. Coole.—Could your plan do anything towards helping the Kildare-place training school?—I am afraid not, because it is the very essence of Mr. Fortescue's plan that there should be a great model school carried on entirely upon the nonsectarian principle, and separate entirely from the domestic life of the boarding-house attached; but the Kildare-place model school is carried on upon denominational principles.

23439. Then you do not contemplate any plan of admitting teachers to certificate by examination only without having been trained in some place you recognized yourselves?—I should be delighted to give certificates to teachers educated in any way, whom the State directed us to examine, and where we found upon examination to be thoroughly well fitted for the trade of teaching.

23440. Without insisting upon their having been in any training school designated by you?—I think so. If the State were anxious, we should examine teachers educated in any manner whatsoever, who wished to devote themselves to the profession of teaching. I can see no objection at all to our being called upon by the State to examine those teachers, and to certify as to their fitness as point of knowledge and of teaching power, as tested in our schools here. I have never considered the point. This is an off-hand opinion, but I am inclined to think it would be the just thing.

23441. If the Roman Catholic authorities were to set up a training school of their own, and send off their

Feb. 12, 1899.

—  
 Right Hon.  
 Alexander  
 Macdonnell

Feb. 13, 1868.  
Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

people, when they thought them prepared, to a general examination in Dublin, you would see no objection to receiving them and granting them certificates, if competent?—I should be delighted, so far as I understand the question, to acquiesce in such an arrangement.

23832. But as I understand you, you see a difficulty in including any such institution?—I could not be a party to that.

23833. The *Chairman*.—Has it not occasionally happened that teachers, trained in Kildare-place, have come before the National Board, and passed as teachers in their schools?—I believe a great number of what were Church Education schools have from time to time been put under us, and that teachers trained to the Kildare-place schools have become National teachers. We are very happy to receive them.

23834. *Sir Robert Keane*.—When the teachers from the Church Education schools come to you, did you not before admitting them to examination, keep them under training and instruction for some time in your own establishment?—No; when a Church Education school is placed under us, as often occurs, our Inspector examines the school and the teacher, and if he finds the teacher is capable of carrying on the school, we don't imagine where he was trained, we admit him.

23835. *Mr. Staines*.—He would be counted amongst the untrained teachers?—Yes.

23836. *Sir Robert Keane*.—Do you object him?—We object him of course. As soon as he becomes a teacher of the National Board, he is in the usual course of things examined by a Board, consisting of the Head Inspector and the Inspector, and they place him in whatever class they find him worthy of.

23837. *Mr. Stokes*.—Are you aware that the Catholic teachers who take service in model schools are thereby precluded from obeying the precepts of their church in many cases?—I know very little with regard to that question. I believe that a great number of them find it difficult to be admitted to communion, as consequence of their being teachers in model schools.

23838. In any such case are not the temporal interests of the teacher placed in direct antagonism with his spiritual duties?—It is for the teacher to consider that question, I am unable to advise upon it.

23839. So far as the National Board favour a system of that kind, would it not be true to say that it adopts the practice now considered hateful, of the old Charter schools, and betrays Catholics to abandon their religion?—I have never known a single instance of a Catholic teacher who held a situation in a model school, as principal or assistant, I think, except one, who ever became a Protestant, and I believe that as a body they are extremely attentive to their religious duties.

23840. *Rev. Dr. Walsh*.—Was it established as a fact that in that one case, it was owing to connexion with the National system of education the change was effected?—Not in the slightest degree. I know a good deal about the case.

23841. *Mr. Stokes*.—Are you acquainted with the meaning of the phrase current amongst Roman Catholics, "out of the Church"?—No.

23842. Are you aware that in order to be in strict communion with the Catholic Church, a Catholic is bound to approach the sacraments once a year, at Easter?—I believe that is the rule.

23843. Are you aware also that those Catholic teachers who take service in model schools are not able to fulfil that condition, and therefore are, so far "out of the Catholic Church"?—I don't understand the subject enough to give an opinion upon the question. All I know is that I believe them to be a most extraordinary and religious body of people, both male and female—like Catholic teachers in our model schools.

23844. *Sir Robert Keane*.—Do you consider a mastership in a model school to be a civil employment?—Entirely so.

23845. Under the civil Government?—Yes.

23846. Do you consider the civil Government should take cognizance of religious penalties imposed on the fulfilment of civil duties?—As far as possible I think they ought to abstain from taking any cognizance of

such things. I quite admit that if it appeared, after long experience, that the Roman Catholic Church would not admit within its persons who accepted situations under us in our model schools it would be a most lamentable state of things, and that I should be very sorry indeed to place such a temptation before any of my fellow-countrymen. I quite admit that.

23847. *Mr. Stokes*.—Is it not a fundamental principle of the National system to treat Catholics fairly, and to afford them opportunities of education without violating the dictates of their religion in any way?—No doubt that is our wish.

23848. Would these new training institutions you contemplate, correspond to the district model schools or to the central establishment here in Dublin?—Both. They would be like the model school in Dublin, and very like the district model schools also. In both there would be always a great model school carried on upon the strict principle of the National education system, and there would be persons employed as pupil-teachers, who would have the means of being lodged comfortably.

23849. Is it not the design of the district model schools that the young persons who are living there should at a subsequent period be brought to Dublin to complete their course?—It is desirable. It is not necessary. I think a person thoroughly well educated at a district model school, and who passes through the whole mentorship and pupil-teaching course is able to carry on a school very well. It is, however, exceedingly desirable, and is always wished for by the Commissioners, that such a person should complete his training in Dublin.

23850. What I wish to ask is whether the young persons trained in the new institutions would be liable to be called to Dublin to finish their education?—Certainly they would not be required to come.

23851. Suppose of the two classes, Protestant and Catholic, one class refuse to come to Dublin while they had the opportunity of doing so, would that class be placed at any disadvantage?—Suppose these are Protestant and Catholic model schools under local management, and that a pupil-teacher who had been for two years in the Protestant model school, in addition to the long training he had received previous to the completion of his education, then came up and received a covering education at the school in Dublin for half a year or a year, and that the Roman Catholic did not receive the same training, the Roman Catholic would not have the same advantages no doubt.

23852. Is that part of the plan contemplated in Mr. Fortescue's letter?—It is not touched upon at all, but, no doubt, Mr. Fortescue would hope that the pupils educated under this new plan might in many cases complete their education here. He intended that if they did so they should have full liberty of attending all the training that takes place here during the day, and at night, instead of being lodged with the Protestants in the training establishment, they should have full liberty of lodging elsewhere.

23853. Is it not a well-known fact that Catholic teachers are not permitted to come to Dublin to finish their training?—A great number still come. The number has diminished very much. I can remember when four-fifths of the teachers in training were Catholics; now there is only about the same number of Catholic teachers in training as Protestants—somewhat less, I believe two or three less. The relative number has diminished very much within the last ten or twenty years.

23854. Is it not true that in coming to the central training school such teachers disrupted the system or transgressed the orders, so to speak, of the bishops of their Church?—I imagine there is a general prohibition, and we know that the number of Catholic teachers who come to be trained here has lamentably diminished.

23855. With the new institutions which presently would be the scene of training, would the training take place in the boarding-school, or day school?—The training would take place as in the Normal schools here. Our professors of training do not give any special

Feb. 15, 1864.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonell.

ing instructions in the boarding-house. Their business begins in the morning, and continues till late in the evening—five or six o'clock, but after that time the teachers in training are left to their own studies in the training-house.

23834. I understood the proposed institutions would consist of a boarding-house and a school—I ask you where the pupil-teachers would be trained—in it in the sleeping apartments, or in the elementary school?—The training we should profess to give them would be a training to fit them to be teachers, and that training would be carried on from ten o'clock in the morning until they retired to rest.

23837. Part of the training would be given in the boarding establishment and part in the elementary school?—Part of the life of the pupil-teachers would be carried on, of course, in the boarding-house, and I have no doubt a great deal of good would be derived by the pupil-teacher from the superintendence his Church would give him during his training.

23838. Who would be responsible for the training of the pupil-teachers? Would it be the head of the training establishment or the master of the elementary school?—The master of the elementary school. He would be selected by the persons who conducted the whole establishment. He would be carefully selected. In case a Roman Catholic, he would probably be selected by the bishop of the diocese for the purpose of being the teacher of the school and the trainer of the pupil-teachers during the day.

23839. Do you consider the master of an ordinary elementary school to be qualified to form the character, raise the tone of feeling, and cultivate generally the minds of the pupil-teachers who would be placed in these new training schools?—I have no doubt that between the excellent education they would get in the elementary school, and the life they would lead together in the boarding-house, the minds of the young men would, in the course of two years, be formed admirably well for their future life.

23840. Would you not think it possible a conflict might arise between the persons responsible for the boarding establishment and those who conducted the elementary school as to the line to be adopted in particular cases for the training?—I don't think any conflict would arise. The teacher would be selected by the persons who had the management of the boarding establishment; he would be superintended by them, and I have no fear at all that there would be anything like a conflict.

23841. Would the head of the boarding establishment have the appointment of the teacher of the elementary school?—I conceive the person who would superintend the boarding establishment would be a person named, in all probability—in case a Catholic—by the bishop of the diocese or by the parish priest, and that that person would have the management of the training establishment. Suppose it was the parish priest, he would, very likely, be manager of the school and also as the general conductor of the training establishment have the appointment of the superintendent of that establishment and all the teachers.

23842. Mr. Sullivan.—Then the training school that would be contemplated under Mr. Fortescue's letter would differ from the existing model schools in the fact that the teachers would not be appointed by the Board?—The teacher would be appointed by the manager.

23843. It would be like an ordinary non-vested school?—Vested or non-vested, the patron appoints the teacher.

23844. Mr. Stokes.—Do you think such an institution would be in any sense parochial?—I don't think so.

23845. How would you secure the attendance of children at such elementary schools?—All we should have to see to would be that there would be an attendance. I have no fear but that there would be plenty of attendance. We could not continue our grant unless there was the requisite number of children in actual attendance.

23846. Do you not think it highly probable that unless the school were placed under the parish priest the children would in time be forced not to attend the school, and the whole system of training would fail?—The moment the attendance failed we should withdraw our grant. I suppose in every case the parish priest or the bishop of the diocese would organize the establishment.

23847. Would you think it right to encourage persons to spend large sums of money in establishing training schools which would be likely to fail?—I think failure would be extremely unlikely.

23848. Did you ever hear the history of the Kneller Hall training school?—I did.

23849. That was one of the rocks on which it split. None of the local clergy had authority. Would not that failure be more likely to occur in Ireland than in England?—It is most unlikely that any of these schools contemplated in Mr. Fortescue's letter would fail in regard to attendance. Those schools that would be Catholic would be under the protection of the bishop of the diocese and the priest of the parish. If in 1849 they were attended by 150 children, they would be almost certain to remain so.

23850. Who would find the money to start such institutions?—I don't think there would be very much money required. The building of the house would not require a very large sum, and the school would support itself, a school of 150 children with a large corps of teachers.

23851. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Would you build the school?—Sometimes we should, and sometimes not. It would entirely depend upon the circumstances of the case. Supposing there was a school already existing that might become a model school. Supposing that the conduct of the school preferred on the whole to have it what is called non-vested, they would build it. Supposing they saw no objection to the principle of vested schools, and demanded the usual allowance towards the building, we should give two-thirds of the whole amount. In many cases they might prefer, on the whole, to have a non-vested school, because, as you know, parties carrying on non-vested schools, are not required to allow parties of other persuasions to give religious instruction in the schools.

23852. Mr. Stokes.—Would you require the domestic arrangements to be such as to satisfy the regulations of your Board with regard, for example, to the cultural contents of air supplied to each dormitory?—No. We should require them to have the school area requisite for each child. With regard to the boarding-house itself, we certainly could not expect it to be carried on with all the amount of comfort of the lodging-houses of the central model establishment.

23853. The estimate in England for building a training school is £150 per student's accommodation. Would your new training schools, do you think, cost anything like that sum?—I should think not.

23854. Do you not think it necessary in having teachers trained that they should be properly housed in all respects with reference to decency, and everything of that kind?—Very desirable; but we might with great safety leave that to the discretion of the persons who would establish these training houses.

23855. In your existing district model schools, is there not a difference of treatment between the male and female pupil-teachers?—There is. We have no means of giving lodging to the female pupil-teachers. They have to live outside the establishment. In all the district model schools the male pupil-teachers are lodged in the house—the female lodges outside, and get an allowance of £20 a year each.

23856. You are not responsible for the lodging of the female pupil-teachers?—We are responsible in this way, that if we heard of any misconduct we should examine into it. Everything of that sort is closely watched.

23857. Meanwhile what you do is to allow them £20 a year?—Yes.

23858. Do you not think the same plan might be adopted with reference to the new training institutions,

Feb. 14, 1883.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell

without requiring farther, that is to say, to offer certain good elementary schools, which might come up fully to the mark of the Board, so many places of £20 a year each, leaving the managers of the school to board pupil-teachers, while in training, subject to your regulations?—That would simplify the preceding very much; but I imagine you would not find that plan acceptable to the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. I believe they would infinitely prefer to have their young people trained during the day in the model school, and living together under the superintendence of their clergy in lodging houses selected by them for that purpose.

23879. Would not the plan I suggest leave them wholly unfettered, so that wherever they pleased they might found such institutions, and if not convenient to raise the money to found such institutions they might make other arrangements acceptable to themselves?—I have no doubt if it were the expressed wish of the Catholic clergy that there should be the option left, either to lodge their young people in lodging houses, selected by themselves, or outside, that the National Board would be happy to give that option.

23880. Do you find that the training of the female teachers, dealt with as you describe, gives as great satisfaction as the training of male pupil-teachers in model schools?—I believe it does; I never heard that there was any sensible difference; at the same time, I have no doubt that in the whole there must be, if one were to examine closely into it. I have no doubt, the enormous state that the young men every evening after their work, pursue their studies together, under the direction of the teachers of the school, must give them a greater advantage in pursuing those studies, than if the same persons were left to lodge in any house in town without any such assistance. At the same time, I do not believe there is so great a disadvantage in the case of the young women who now lodge in private houses, I believe their education goes on very well.

23881. Has it not been reported by several of your Inspectors, as the practical result, that a larger proportion of the female pupil-teachers become afterwards school teachers, than in the case with the male pupil-teachers boarded in the houses with the masters?—I believe the fact to be that throughout Ireland there is a greater tendency on the part of females to take to the trade of teaching, and that they are becoming more and more relatively numerous every day as teachers. It is far more difficult for them to get any other sort of employment. The employment is far more grateful to them, I believe, than it is to the males, and the males have far greater facilities of pursuing their way in life. In America, where some twenty or thirty years ago, there were comparatively few female teachers, they are now becoming a great deal more numerous than the males.

23882. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you consider the Roman Catholic bishops, and the Roman Catholics generally, would be satisfied with the arrangement that has been proposed, according to which an expensive central establishment would be maintained for the small number?—I think they would rather see the central establishment done away with altogether, but I believe if it is not to be done away with, of which I conceive there is no chance at all, they would be extremely gratified by having model schools of their own, under their own management.

23883. Would it be a permanently satisfactory arrangement that would merely give a certain sum of money to each individual teacher, to lodge where he liked, and give no contribution whatever from the State to those religious bodies, who would maintain training houses, while the State paid a very large sum annually for the maintenance of a particular system of training, do you think that would be a complete and permanent solution of the difficulty?—I do not know that it would be a complete solution of the difficulty. I know it would be a diminution of the apparent hardship. It would go far to reconcile the Roman Catholic Church to the present system of education.

23884. Is it desirable that every settlement of the education question, or attempt to settle it, should be

done by instalments in this way—that each time there is an outcry there should be a certain instalment given, and a certain arrangement made, which must lead to a re-opening of the question?—I should like any settlement of the question which would satisfy as much as possible the whole country, Protestant and Catholic, provided the great principle of united education was not touched. But, putting aside the theoretical question, which is the better mode of educating the people, is it not desirable that question of education should be so settled that it would not be continually re-opened?—It would be very desirable, but I believe if we are to attempt to solve the difficulty by giving great grants of public money to a large number of establishments, such as you are now speaking of, for the domestic life of the teachers in training, you would find that the people of England and Scotland, and the Protestants of Ireland, would be entirely opposed to such a thing, and that would be so solution of the difficulty. It would solve it for one party, and re-open new sources of opposition from others.

23885. But is not that exactly the point that I put, that it is the presence of the great majority of the empire that keeps the matter from being finally settled to the satisfaction of the great majority of this country, for whose benefit the system was originally established?—It is the conscientious feeling I conceive of the great majority of the people of this country that it is useless to grant of public money should be given to this country for the denominational education of any portion of the people, be they either Protestant or Catholic.

23886. Quite so—for the denominational?—The grant would be for strictly denominational education if the money was given by the State for carrying on the domestic life of those sixteen students under the superintendence of their own clergy, and the exclusive education of Catholics.

23887. If the same benefit were accorded to all other denominations would the State in that case be supporting any particular religious institution?—In such case it would.

23888. Would these institutions for training teachers be really religious institutions?—Such institutions as you contemplate would be exclusive institutions, they would be carried on entirely by the clergy of the particular denomination, and they would be attended exclusively by persons of one Church.

23889. Would not the same be the case with the particular schools proposed to be used as training schools, would they not in point of fact be denominational in the full sense of the word?—They would be denominational very often in attendance. They would sometimes be exclusively attended by Protestants or Catholics as the case might be; but they would be open to Christians of every denomination, and the whole system of education from morning till night carried on with perfect security to either Catholics or Protestants who might attend the school.

23890. Now, Mr. Coates.—In the course of inquiry into the model schools, certain cases have come before us in different parts of the country where schools have arisen in connexion with pupil-teachers, have there been always brought up to the Board, do you suppose?—I believe always. The number of such cases is very few, they hardly ever occur, and I believe that as a body our pupil-teachers are remarkably pure in their conduct. I think it is almost impossible to conceive there could be much immorality taking place in any one of these twenty-six distinct model schools which are viewed with so much jealousy by the Roman Catholics, which are disliked even by Protestants, and which are examined most closely by every sort of person.—I think under such circumstances there could be very few cases which would not be made known.

23891. Do you feel confident any such case would have been sure to have been brought up to the Board?—I think so.

23892. Mr. Stokely.—Will they reach the Board before positive proof has got into the hands of the Inspectors?—A case occurred the other day in one of our model schools. A case was reported to us that a

Feb. 12, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

girl—an assistant-teacher there—had been lodging in the house with a widow, who was the owner of the house. She was reprimanded for that, and directed to find a lodging in a more convenient and becoming place. She went to another house, and our Inspector very properly ascertained where she had gone to, and finding it was a house still less fitted for her—it was not inhabited by persons he approved of—she reported the matter, and she has been dismissed from the school. This was brought immediately before the Board.

23893. Looking at the probability that the young Catholic pupil-teachers admitted to the new training schools would in most cases be boarded by Christian Brothers and by nuns, or, in short, in religious houses of one sort or another, do you not think it would be a safe statement on the part of the Government to say, "We will not make ourselves responsible for the places where you board—we will provide you with a suit of gossamer, and board where you like?"—that is, in the new institutions?—If it was approved of by the Roman Catholic Church I think there would be no objection. It would simplify our proceedings, but I believe the Roman Catholic Church would object altogether to such an arrangement.

23894. Why should they object?—They would much rather the young people would lodge all together in houses approved of by them, and of which the managers should have the appointment of the superintendents.

23895. But if all the regulations were left in their hands quite independently of State control, could they not find such houses as they would prefer?—Certainly.

23896. Why, then, should they object to such an arrangement?—Supposing we have a training institution under Mr. Fortescue's letter, with fifteen young men Catholic pupil-teachers, the question is, where they shall board. It is proposed, I understand, for this Board to make itself responsible in some respect for the houses where they will board. Knowing as we do full well they will be boarded with Christian Brothers, we will say, is it not likely an arrangement of that kind will excite prejudice—will be brought before the House of Commons, and lead to acrimonious discussions?—Whereas, instead of the Board making itself responsible, they could say, we will provide you with £20 a year, board where you will, provided we are satisfied it is a suitable boarding-house—the Catholic bishop would provide the houses and you would not be responsible for any religious arrangements that would offend the prejudices of Protestants?—It would be much more convenient for us if such an arrangement were acceptable to the Catholic Church. If they prefer that to the plan sketched by Mr. Fortescue, I am sure I should be too happy it would be adopted. I rather think the Catholic Church would not approve of that plan.

23897. The Chairman.—Originally, was it not intended the model schools should be of moderate size, and of a very inexpensive character?—Certainly, it was.

23898. When did the more expensive plans begin to be adopted?—We never had any distinct model schools established till 1849—the first was opened about 1849. The plan was sketched, I think, in 1846, but the first built were in 1849. They proved to be a great deal more expensive than the Commissioners on the first institution of this Board had contemplated.

23899. Did the ideas of the Board become expanded, as you lay the fault on the Board of Works?—I think it was that our notion of the nature of these distinct model schools expanded—became much larger.

23900. Have the Board had much pressure from the model schools to raise the standard of education in the upper classes in those places where a large proportion of the pupils are children of persons in comfortable circumstances?—I don't think there has been any pressure of that sort; generally speaking, where persons of a somewhat higher description than usual send their children to model schools, the schools are such as a higher kind of education would naturally be given in, as in the Belfast and Dublin model schools. The

schools being very large, and the teachers very well paid, not only by the State, but by the fees of the pupils, they are of a higher description; they give a higher education, and are more likely to attract persons of a somewhat better class in life.

23901. Naturally those schools in populous places would contain a larger proportion of pupils of the upper classes, but what I wanted to ascertain was whether the Board were asked to countenance, or did countenance, the conversion of such schools into what are practically middle-class schools?—Never.

23902. Or has it ever been their practice to discourage the poorer classes from attending if they could pay a penny a week?—Never.

23903. Rev. Mr. Conne.—Have you ever had any demand for classical instruction to be given in model schools?—Yes; there has been a very great movement in Ireland in favour of engrafting classical education upon the National system. I have no doubt at all it could easily be done, especially in model schools. I have no doubt there could be 400 or 500 schools in Ireland, like the parish schools in Scotland, in which a very considerable amount of rough classical education could be given to children attending the schools.

23904. Has there been any demand to have modern languages taught?—Yes, the classical education and the modern languages would be confined to such pupils as attended the higher classes in the school, and were anxious for education in classics and French. The condition upon which that higher education would be given would be that it should not interfere in the slightest degree with the elementary education.

23905. Have you never had demands made upon you to separate the children of the poor from the children of the rich?—Never, and I don't believe that in the government of these schools there has been the slightest partiality shown to the rich or to the poor. I believe there is practically the same advantage for both poor and rich. These schools as well as the ordinary schools have not been confined to the destitute poor, but are open to others. We hear a great deal about wealthy people and professional persons sending their children to these schools, but I believe the whole number is very small, and while the education is a great benefit to them, it has done no injury whatever to the poor.

23906. Mr. Stokes.—Was not the foundation of separate middle schools contiguous to model schools contemplated in the scheme you originally drew up?—It was. I was very anxious I remember in old times that we should be allowed to try and introduce middle class education in the immediate neighbourhood of our central school. It would have been necessary to have had a separate grant for the purpose. I believe that whereas the middle class education of Dublin is lamentably bad, that if we had been allowed to found an excellent half centralised or half classical school in the immediate neighbourhood of the place, and have employed as the teachers in that school in a great degree the able of the teachers trained here, we should have been enabled to exhibit an excellent specimen of middle class education.

23907. In the original scheme for the foundation of distinct model schools do you not remember it was proposed that the site should be half an acre—not two acres as in Kimmage, but half an acre, which was supposed to give enough of space for a middle class school contiguous to the model school?—I don't remember that.

23908. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Has this demand for classical education been confined to model schools alone?—Not at all. As I mentioned, there is a great deal and for it in other National schools, and I believe a greater improvement could not take place in the education of the people of Ireland than if we were allowed to select some 400 or 500 of the best National schools where the teachers should by degrees become acquainted with classics, and where a rough classical education, such as is given in the parish schools of Scotland, should be given to children who reach the Fourth Book, and whose parents wished them to receive a

Feb. 25, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell,

chemical education. Of course, the chemical education must be so conducted as not in the slightest degree to interfere with the education of the really poor.

23909 Can you say whether there has been of late an increase in the number of young Roman Catholic persons coming up for training?—No; I imagine there has been a great falling off on the whole.

23910 I mean for last year compared with the previous year?—The Catholic teachers and non-teachers, taken together, averaged 75 per cent, on the fourteenth during the five years before the prohibition. They averaged 50 per cent during the last five years, and the attendance is growing less.

23911 Can you state what it is this year in comparison with previous years?—This is the note that has been made for me.—Of the persons (male and female) trained during the five years ending December, 1862, the Catholic teachers—i.e., principals and assistants—averaged 65 per cent, or two-thirds. During the following five years, ending December, 1867, the Catholic teachers averaged only 34 per cent, or one-third. Average for 1868, 34; average at present (spring 1869), 31. Number of Catholic clergymen who have allowed their teachers to come up for training this season, 20. Number of Catholic teachers who have come up against the wishes of their managers, and have lost their schools in consequence, 6. The Catholic teachers and non-teachers taken together averaged 75 per cent, or three-fourths, during the first five years, and 50 per cent, or one half during the last five years. It is a very lamentable fact. It shows very clearly that instead of the Catholics being starved out of education in our national training establishment they are becoming every day more disinclined to send their teachers to the national establishment.

23912 Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Has not the whole number of persons in training been diminishing?—No; we have only the means of training 360 per annum at this place, and that number is kept up, because, in consequence of the falling off in the number of school teachers—for whom, no doubt, this training was originally intended—who come to be trained, we have, I think, very properly, given training here to pupil-teachers, and other persons. We believe are anxious to become teachers, and are fit for it.

23913 Mr. Sullivan.—So that, as the numbers stand, very nearly 20 per cent of the whole of the persons in training during this past year being Catholics are non-teachers, and therefore independent of the managers of schools for the time being?—Very many of the persons who are now in training are persons who are not teachers of National schools.

23914 So that for the time being 20 out of the 50 per cent of Catholics in training can hardly be estimated as coming contrary to the wishes of the clergy?—Certainly there is a great number of them not connected with any National school at all. There is also a great number of Catholics who come up here to be trained who are the teachers of schools under lay Catholics, and there is also a very considerable number who are teachers of National schools of which the managers are Protestants.

23915 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Enjoying that freedom, does it not show their willingness to avail themselves of good training?—I am quite sure, if left to themselves, they would infinitely prefer to come. But I am equally certain that if left to themselves, and if they had the power of going to such training houses as was contemplated in Mr. Fortescue's letter, this reverence for the Church would lead them to prefer decidedly the latter place to the present training schools. With regard to this important question of the model schools, I was called upon at one time to draft an answer to the memorial of the Catholic prelates, addressed to the Government against model schools. Although that draft was not adopted finally by the Board, yet, as it expresses my honest and deliberate opinions upon the subject of the model schools, and the question of united education, I should like to read it for you now, and put it in evidence. I will read it from a parliamentary paper, 1340, ordered by the House of Com-

mons to be printed, 25th July, 1867. It is as follows:—

"Two proposals are made to the Government by the Roman Catholic prelates in their letter addressed to Sir George Grey. The first is, that in future all the Roman Catholic schools, which at present are attended exclusively by Catholics, should become strictly denominational. The second is, that all the model schools at present conducted by the Board should be at once abolished.

"With regard to the first proposal, we are directed by the Board to state that it would be entirely opposed to the fundamental principles of the National system, and would ensure its certain and speedy ruin. The demands made by the Roman Catholic prelates in their Memorial to the Irish Government in 1859, were substantially the same as are contained under this head in the present letter. The answer given by Mr. Cardwell to that Memorial is equally applicable to the present demands. To that worthy State Paper we beg to refer the Secretary in the best answer that can be given to the present proposal.

"So long as it was generally, though erroneously, believed that united education under the National system was a failure, that it was a piebald, but a victorious scheme, it is not surprising that many sensible men were not unwilling that it should be abandoned. The experiment has, however, now proved entirely successful. In the past year of 1868, containing about two millions of people, and which is the only part of Ireland where the Protestants and Roman Catholics are found in nearly equal numbers, the model schools form 86 per cent of all the National schools.

"The proportion of school children as compared with those attended by children of only one denomination is constantly increasing throughout Ireland. Thus, for example, in 1866 there were 80,121 Protestants, and 213,213 Roman Catholic children attending national schools during the single quarter ended 31st December. During the same quarter in the year 1868, there were 103,532 Protestants and 359,898 Roman Catholics, receiving united education in National schools. Of the entire Protestant pupils educated during the year under the Board, more than four-fifths are educated in model schools.

"Compared with the number of Roman Catholics attending National schools under Roman Catholic management in which Protestants are educated, the Protestant pupils are, administratively few in number. In the south, middle, and west of Ireland, where the Protestant poor are in the country districts scattered about everywhere, but numbers collected in large numbers, three or four Protestant children will often be found in National schools amongst many scores of Roman Catholic pupils. This fact has naturally been a source of uneasiness to the total failure of united education. But, surely, the master is the minority of Protestant pupils in a National school, the more do they need that that school should be accessible to them, as it is impossible for them to be educated in a school of their own Church, and the more do they require in the existing National school the protection of our rules against proscription or ignorance of any kind. Where the minority are in a minority of thirty, they are to a great degree protected themselves from injustice. But the rules of the Board not only protect the minority of two or three from being oppressed but effectively prevent the 97 from being oppressors. They are bound to do and to any nothing within the walls of any National school from year's end to year's end that can give pain to a single child of a different faith from their own. If the Protestant minority are thus saved from all interference with their religious faith, the Roman Catholic majority are, at the same time, habituated to the constant exercise of true practical charity, and they do, in fact, exhibit the most unexampled regard for the feelings of those who differ from them both in religion and in race.

"Great as are the advantages of united education in a country disorganised like Ireland, the Commissioners could not conscientiously support it, were it proved to be less favorable than denominational education to the social and moral education of the people, or could it be proved to endanger the faith of the children. But what is the fact? United Education has been established in Ireland for thirty years. The number of children enjoyed under it is admitted to be superior to that enjoyed by the poor of almost any other nation. And the people, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant, who have been educated in National schools, are confessedly as religious and as moral as any in the world. The very persons who denounce the National schools as 'Gallies,' and as unfavorable to the Roman Catholic faith, are the loudest in asserting, with perfect truth, that the Catholics, poor of Ireland, educated as they almost entirely have been during the last thirty-four years in National schools, are the most devoted and the most moral Roman Catholics in Europe.

"The success of the National system, especially with respect to united education was, for a long time, impeded by

the opposition of the members, both clerical and lay, of the Established Church. Had they from the first actually adopted the system in a noble spirit of impartiality, its good results, great as they have been in spite of all opposition, would have been infinitely greater. To substitute for it any Protestant system, or to endeavour to work the present National system in an unimpaired and sectarian spirit, is now proved to be impossible. Now, therefore, is the time when, if the Government firmly resists all attempts to abolish mixed education, we may confidently expect that the great bulk of the Irish landlords will employ upon the National schools on their estates those large sums of money, and, what is of far more importance, those benevolent feelings which have hitherto been, in too many cases, wasted upon the maintenance of schools that can never be accepted by the great majority of the people of Ireland.

With regard to the second proposal of the Roman Catholic prelates, that the model schools of the Commission should be forthwith abolished, the Commissioners first say to any that, even if those schools were for the time exclusively attended by Protestants, that continuation would not form a valid ground for their abolition. These schools were from the first suggested by the founders of the National system as an essential part of it. They were warmly supported by the two Roman Catholic primates, Archbishop Murray, and Archbishop Cullen (namely that ought never to be mentioned by the friends of impartial education and religious peace in Ireland without reverence and gratitude), and they were at first denounced by the great majority of the members of the Established Church. And yet the Board, trusting that time and reason would temper the opposition of their Protestant constituents, continued that, while the model schools greatly benefited the Roman Catholics who attended them, they could not possibly injure the Protestants who declined to do so, never thought of abolishing these schools in consequence of Protestant opposition. At present the case is somewhat reversed. About a half only of the people are Catholics. The schools have indeed been denounced by the Roman Catholic bishops, but there is no opinion of the National system so cordially and so universally approved of by Protestants as are the model schools. The Protestants now say that, without these model schools it would be impossible for the future teachers of the 6,399 ordinary National schools to be trained from such a high level for their calling, that without these schools no perfect schools could be exhibited throughout Ireland of the best methods of popular education, above all that no other examples approaching to these in excellence could be presented to the people of Ireland of the advantages of mixed education, and of the best means for carrying it into effect. Could it indeed be proved that these model schools, however beneficial to Protestants, were injurious to the faith or to the secular advantages of the Roman Catholics, who either attended or declined to attend them, the Government might be justified in abolishing them. But as one can with truth assert that they are, in any respect, injurious to Roman Catholics. The most that can be said against them is, what it is to be deeply deplored, that they have been denounced by the spiritual guides of the great majority of the people of Ireland, and that, in consequence, they have been, in some way, deserted in a great degree by the Roman Catholic laity. The Commissioners, however, insist that this opposition will gradually decline, as has been the case with respect to that of the members of the Established Church.

"Had anything approaching to compulsion, or dishonest inducements, been held out to the attendance of Roman Catholic pupils at these schools much might be said against them. But so far from this being the case, the Commissioners have never refused to endorse, in the immediate neighbourhood of a model school, a well conducted rival school, under Roman Catholic management, though well aware that it had been established for the express purpose of drawing away from the model school the Roman Catholic children attending it. And for so doing, the Board has incurred the severe censure of many of its warmest Protestant supporters.

"So long, however, as these model schools continue to be, as they now are, amongst the best examples in the world of sound secular instruction, free from all danger of proselytism—so long as they are crowded with children anxious to be educated there in preference to all other schools—the Commissioners will continue to support them on the same grounds of justice, and of public good, that have induced them, at all hazards, to support their Roman Catholic co-existent schools against the vehement opposition of the Protestants of Ireland, who do not avail themselves of these schools, and who regard them as entirely unsuitable for mixed education.

"ALEX. MACDONNELL."

23016. Mr. Sullivan.—Is it not the fact that a considerable number of the persons at present being educated in the Central Training School, neither being teachers nor likely to become teachers, the State is, therefore, educating a very large number of people without any prospective benefit for the expenditure?—I think it is almost certain that all, or nearly all, will become teachers. I believe the great majority of them are pupil-teachers, and other persons who have been in National schools and are anxious to become teachers, and for that purpose they request permission to receive training as teachers.

23017. Rev. Mr. Cosse.—Have you any security whatever that the persons, living in your establishment here, will become teachers?—No security, except the strong probability that they will.

23018. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I presume your district and other inspectors usually discover, from speaking to the young parties, what their design is, and on that understanding they are recommended?—Yes.

23019. Mr. Sullivan.—About 30 per cent. of the whole number of Catholics at present in the institution have no hope so long as the present agitation against the system lasts—of getting schools?—A great number of them could get schools under Protestant patronage living in Catholic parts of the country, and who appoint Roman Catholic teachers to their schools. I think there are altogether about 600 schools under Protestant managers, in which these managers appoint Roman Catholic teachers.

23020. Would that number of schools be really sufficient to absorb 30 per cent. of the persons trained annually?—In addition to these there are all the schools under lay Catholic management, and I do not believe the lay Catholic managers object to teachers trained here.

23021. There are 30 per cent. of the total number of Roman Catholics also sent up by that class of managers, and by Protestant patrons?—Yes. It may still be very difficult for the young Catholics who are trained here to get schools.

23022. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In addition to Roman Catholics lay managers absorbing a number of your trained teachers, does not the fact you have already mentioned of several Roman Catholic clergymen allowing their teachers to come up for training prove their willingness to accept trained teachers?—I understand a good number of Catholic clerical managers allow their teachers to come to be trained.

23023. And who thereby express their preference to teachers trained in connection with your Board?—Certainly.

[Adjourned.]

Feb. 15, 1869.

Right Hon.  
Alexander Macdonnell.

SIXTY-THIRD DAY.—DUBLIN, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1869

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNMURRAY, K.P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMURRAY.  
The Right Hon. Mr. JAMES MOHRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BRIDGES, Esq., M.C.

Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COTTELL, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q.C.  
SCOTT NICHOLSON STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } *Secretaries*  
D. B. DUNNE, Esq., }

Feb. 15, 1869

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

The Right Hon. ALEXANDER MACDONNELL further examined.

23924. Mr. SULLIVAN.—Will you have the goodness to read these two paragraphs which I point out for you in Lord Stanley's letter?—Yes. "For the success of the undertaking much must depend upon the character of the individuals who compose the Board, and upon the security thereby afforded to the country that while the interests of religion are not overlooked, the most scrupulous care shall be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian people. To attain the first object it appears essential that the Board should be composed of men of high personal character, including individuals of exalted station in the Church, to attain the latter, that it should consist of persons professing different religious opinions."

23925. How far does the Board as at present constituted carry out the view expressed by Lord Stanley in the passages which you have just read?—In one respect the Board as at present constituted does not fully carry out his wishes—that it should consist partly of individuals of high position.

23926. At the commencement I think there was the Primates of Ireland—the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, and the Provost of Trinity College, representing the Church of England?—Yes.

23927. Dr. MUNAY, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, represented the Roman Catholics, and Dr. COTTELL, a Presbyterian, represented, as your Commissioner, the Presbyterians. What is the representation of the Church of England now on the Board, so far as the clerical element is concerned?—Mr. JELFITT, is the only clergyman of the Church of England who is a member of the Board. He is a very distinguished Fellow of Trinity College.

23928. And as to the Roman Catholics?—There is no Roman Catholic ecclesiastic on the Board.

23929. And as to the Presbyterians?—There is the Moderator of the Synod of Ulster, the Rev. Dr. MORRIS, and the Rev. Dr. HENRY, President of Queen's College, Belfast.

23930. Thus in fact since the first establishment of the Board there has been a gradual deterioration in the grades of the clerical representation as to two of the Churches. The representation of one of the Churches has vanished altogether, and the representation of another has come down from the Primates, an Archbishop, and the Provost, to a Fellow of Trinity College?—We had lately a bishop of the Established Church. The Late Bishop of Derry was a member of the Board till his death. Since that time there has been no bishop appointed by the Government to fill his place, but the Rev. Dr. JELFITT has been put into the vacancy.

23931. The Rev. Dr. COTTELL withdrew in 1838?—Yes.

23932. He was succeeded if I recollect rightly by the President of the Queen's College, Belfast, Dr. HENRY?—Yes.

23933. Dr. COTTELL had I think, two nephews on the inspection staff?—Not that I am aware of.

23934. Dr. BELFITT and Mr. COTTELL, were they not his nephews?—I don't know in what relation the persons

you name stood to him. Their appointment took place before my time.

23935. Had the Rev. Mr. COTTELL, besides being a good Commissioner, acted also as the compiler of the books, and professor of education?—Yes.

23936. And a nephew-in-law of his assisted in the preparation of the books, and acted as head master of the school, Dr. McARTIN?—I am not aware whether there was any relationship at all between them.

23937. Were Dr. HENRY's expenses paid in coming to the Board, as a member of it, when he became President of the Queen's College, Belfast? Did he not spend a good deal of his time from one cause or another in Dublin?—He was a good deal in the neighbourhood of Dublin, after he became President of the Queen's College Belfast.

23938. And a very constant attendant at the Board?—He was.

23939. I find in a return for the year 1838, that he attended twenty-four ordinary meetings, and nine special meetings in that year. Now were all his expenses while living in Dublin paid out of the funds of the National Board?—When he came from his residence in Belfast, to attend the meetings of the Board he was paid at the rate of £5 a visit. I think that was the practice.

23940. Even when he resided for a considerable time in Dublin, and did not come from Belfast?—Not that I am aware of. He was not paid at that rate then; it was when he came from Belfast he was paid for his travelling expenses, and his personal expenses while in Dublin, at the rate of £5 each visit. The same sum was paid to Bishop DEERY, who was Roman Catholic Bishop of Belfast, and who had in the same way to come from Belfast to attend our meetings. It seemed to be a reasonable sum to give.

23941. Would there be any objection to giving a return of the money paid to the several members of the Commission for travelling expenses from 1838, the date of Dr. HENRY's appointment?—If you put in a paper requesting that a return of that sort should be given, I should think it could be done.

23942. When the report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Queen's College was drawn up, recommending that the Presidents should reside in their colleges, there was a considerable falling off was there not, in the attendance of Dr. HENRY at the Board?—I am not aware that there was. Possibly there may have been. I think Dr. HENRY resided pretty regularly for a long time even before the inquiry took place.

23943. I find that the year before the inquiry he put in thirty-four visits, in 1851, fifteen attendances; in 1852, there were thirteen, in 1853, the number was ten, including special and ordinary meetings; in 1854, he attended thirteen ordinary meetings, no special meeting; in 1855, he attended twelve meetings; in 1856, he attended eleven, and the number declined to three in 1857?—He did not attend anything like so constantly of late years as he did in preceding years.

23944. On the recommendation being carried out in



Feb. 15, 1899.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonald

his case was not the Rev. Mr. Hall appointed for the purpose of replacing him on the Board?—I don't think it was in consequence of Dr. Henry not attending as often as he formerly did that Dr. Hall was appointed. Dr. Hall was appointed at the time when there was a considerable increase to the number of Commissioners, and it was thought that inasmuch as the number of the Roman Catholic Commissioners had been largely increased, it would be but equitable that there should be an increase in the number of Presbyterian Commissioners.

23045. The present representative of the Presbyterians is Dr. Morrell, who succeeded Dr. Hall?—Yes, he is a representative.

23046. He has a brother on the inspection staff?—Yes.

23047. His expenses are also paid?—Yes, I need not add that his brother was appointed long before Dr. Morrell had any connection with the Commissioners, and what I stated on a former occasion was, that there never had been, except on one occasion, during the thirty years I have been here, a single officer appointed by the Commissioners, who was in any way connected with the Commissioners of Education.

23048. What explanation can be given of the fact, that there are only two Commissioners besides the Resident Commissioner upon the Finance Committee? Is the Finance Committee appointed by the Board generally?—Any Commissioner who chose to attend the Finance Committee here would be very welcome if he did come, but generally speaking, no Commissioner attends.

23049. The only Commissioners whose names I find in the return before me here as having attended on the Finance Committee besides the Resident Commissioner are the Rev. Dr. Hall and James Gibson, Esq. Are these names returned because of their having happened to attend or because they were appointed members of the Committee?—It was merely because they attended. In truth it very seldom happens that any Commissioners do attend except the Resident Commissioner.

23050. Then these gentlemen are not nominated upon that committee?—There is not any regular nomination.

23051. The Chairman.—Do you understand it to be what is called an open committee?—That is what I always understood—that any Commissioner could, as a matter of right, be present whenever he chose. They never or very seldom do attend.

23052. Mr. Stollman.—Does the same rule apply to the sub-committee? I find the name of only one member of the Board returned as having attended the committee—the Rev. Dr. Hall, who put in two absences in 1886. Has he been returned merely because he was the only Commissioner who did attend?—Yes.

23053. Are notices sent to the different members of the Board of the meeting of these several committees?—No; the Board is well aware that these sub-committees transact a certain amount of routine business. Any Commissioners who are willing to do so may attend, but they seldom or never do.

23054. The Chairman.—Do these sub-committees meet at fixed periods before each Board meeting?—I am always on the spot, and am always ready to meet the sub-committee the Secretary, Chief of Inspection, Accountant, or whenever else his business to be performed.

23055. Mr. Stollman.—Is not the whole business of the Education Commissioners really transacted by these committees?—Very much of it is, everything of a routine nature, as I think I explained several times, is transacted by these sub-committees. Everything that comes before these sub-committees, that is of importance, is referred specially to the Board.

23056. I find given here, as an example of the proceedings, the one on the 26th of March, 1887, and in that programme is the following:—"Report of Finance Committee; ditto of Agricultural Committee; ditto, Sub-Committee; Inspection; Bills of Work, Office Bills

of Work, Clerks' Attendance Book; Reports on Central Model Schools, Reports on Training Homes, Reports on District Schools." Number 10 in the programme is letter 29,167 from the Rev. Dr. Henry; also from the Rev. Dr. McCash on the subject of the introduction of classes, &c., in the Belfast Model Schools. The actual business transacted I find was only No. 10. What became of the remaining nine matters which really comprised the work of the Commission?—All these things were brought before the Board. Any of the Commissioners could have examined into them if they pleased.

23057. Do they ever examine into them?—Very seldom; they take it for granted that when we don't bring forward a case, or bring one of importance, that they ought to examine thoroughly into, that we have decided upon it, and decided fairly. I conceive that if we were to present a great number of these routine matters it would be impossible to get the Commissioners to go into them. Their whole time would be consumed in deciding upon matters that I think every one will admit the Chief of Inspection and the Secretaries, assisted by myself, would be able to settle much more satisfactorily, than if there was a Board of twenty persons to examine into all these details with which they were very little acquainted.

23058. Then so far as the actual Commission itself is concerned, the whole work of the committee is transacted by the Resident Commissioner, and one or two Presbyterian Commissioners?—These are the two Commissioners scarcely ever attend; practically speaking the whole routine business of the Board is transacted by the sub-committee which consist of the chief officers of the Board, assisted by myself.

23059. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Has the Rev. Dr. Hall been a resident in this country for the past eighteen months?—I think it is about eighteen months since he left for America.

23060. And ceased to be a Commissioner?—And ceased to be a Commissioner; an admirable Commissioner he was, if he could attend, but he could not take part in the routine business of the Commission; he had more important business to attend to.

23061. Mr. Stollman.—Then as a matter of fact the Resident Commissioner, the Secretaries, and the Chief of Inspection do all the real work of the Commission?—All the routine business, wherever there is anything of importance it is our duty and I need hardly say it is our interest to bring that important matter specially before the Board.

23062. Are such matters as the firing clerks or reprimanding Inspectors invariably brought before the Board?—I cannot say that reprimands invariably come from the Board, but I am sure in all important cases they do. It very seldom happens that an Inspector is fined, very few instances of that sort have occurred. Whenever an Inspector is to be seriously punished in any way, especially when he is to be fined, removed from his district, or deprived of his office, the case would be immediately brought before the Board, who would enter fully into all the circumstances.

23063. How any dissatisfaction being expressed by any of the Commissioners at the manner of stating the subject upon the programme?—I am not certain there may not have been some one of that sort. I am aware it has very seldom occurred. I don't remember any case myself.

23064. Is it in the power of the Secretaries to arrange the programme that the members of the Board are not able to judge of the importance of the question, seeing that they attend very little to the details?—The Secretary who draws up the programme, comes to consult me with regard to the matters that ought to be placed upon it. I do my best to see that the programme is fairly arranged. I should very much like that any instance was produced in which either a Secretary or myself have used any improper means in drawing up the programme.

23065. Has any statement ever been made to the habits of the different Commissioners are so well known as to the times and seasons of their attendance, that

Feb. 12, 1899.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell

the programme is in fact arranged to meet particular cases?—I have never heard a charge of that kind made, and I am perfectly sure such a thing would be utterly dishonest.

22956. In the name of a Commissioner entered as present at the whole of a day's proceedings, although he may have dropped in to see another member, and soon after gone away?—If he attends at all, his name is entered.

22957. Then, when there is an entry of attendance it does not always imply that the member whose name is so entered really attends at all the business of the Board on that day?—No, it does not. It is possible a Commissioner may have attended only a short time, and have been entered as being present. The statement that he was present does not imply that he was present the whole time the business was in course of transaction.

22958. The Earl of Dunraven.—Are not the entries made according to the usual mode of entering the names of members attending a Board?—I have never heard of any other plan being adopted.

22959. Mr. Sullivan.—In 1854, when the rules were about to be revised under the advice of the Government, was there not a committee appointed, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Healy, Mr. Gilson, and Dr. Andrews, three Presbyterians, Mr. James O'Ferrall, Judge Longfield, and the Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

22960. Do you consider that to have been a fair and adequate representation of the Roman Catholics, bearing in mind the gravity of the duty assigned to the Committee?—I think it would have been more desirable if a greater number of Roman Catholics could have attended. I am not aware that we could get a Roman Catholic gentleman at the time who could have attended regularly. Mr. James O'Ferrall was a most intelligent and most devoted Roman Catholic. He attended regularly, and watched everything as vigilantly as possible. I think that on that, as on many occasions, the Roman Catholics placed great reliance on the thorough integrity and judgment of Judge Longfield, for example, and were quite certain he would never have allowed anything to be done on that occasion against the interest of Roman Catholics. The Catholic members had some confidence also in myself.

22961. Allowing that the most implicit confidence would be rightly placed in both instances, but looking merely at the feelings of the public outside, what do you say?—I think it would be desirable on all occasions to have as fair and adequate a representation of every element as possible. For that reason I was always exceedingly anxious, as is well known, to have the number of Roman Catholic Commissioners increased one-half.

22962. At the time at which this Committee was appointed was it not the fact that the majority of the Roman Catholic members were so circumstanced either as to position or otherwise, that they could not attend the Board at all?—It would have been very difficult for many of them to attend. Mr. James O'Ferrall, so far as I recollect, was the only Roman Catholic member who had sufficient time at his disposal to attend constantly to the working of the Board.

22963. Has that anything to do with the remarkable fact that, out of the forty-four members who had been on the Board from the commencement, twenty-two were lawyers, and that of the present Board of twenty, no less than twelve are lawyers? I would wish to know whether lawyers devote more time than other people to the subject of education?—The reason why there are so many Roman Catholic lawyers on the Board I think is this—that a very great proportion of the highly educated lay Roman Catholics in this country are lawyers, and that it would be extremely difficult in Dublin to get ten Roman Catholic Commissioners, a large proportion of whom should not be lawyers. They are very much occupied, no doubt, with their professions, whether Judges or advocates, but they are always ready on important occasions to

come here and give their whole attention to any critical case that may arise, and I doubt very much whether it is not the interest of the Roman Catholics that they should be very largely represented at this Board by distinguished Roman Catholic lawyers who reside in Dublin.

22974. The Chairman.—With whom does the responsibility of the appointment of Commissioners rest—with this Board or with the Executive Government?—Wholly with the Executive Government.

22975. Mr. Sullivan.—When the Board was reconstituted in 1860, was there any difficulty in getting Catholic members for the reconstituted Board?—I don't think there was. I think Mr. Cardwell used his best exertions to get large numbers of Catholic gentlemen to become Commissioners, and that he succeeded without much difficulty.

22976. Is not the difficulty of getting members increased by the fact of the difference of opinion existing amongst Roman Catholics, especially the Roman Catholic bishops and the Board?—Of course it is greatly increased by that. Were it not so, that difficulty we should have a successor to Archbishop Murray, in an archbishop or a bishop.

22977. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is it within your knowledge that Roman Catholic prelates have been invited to join the Board?—Dr. Denvir was on the Board, but he found it necessary to retire from the Board.

22978. On account of the opposition of his own Church?—Yes; and I conceive there has been everything done on the part of the Government—it was their interest—it was their duty if possible, to get a Catholic prelate to sit here, but I am perfectly certain it was impossible for them to get one.

22979. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I presume that was owing to some action of the bishops themselves?—I have no doubt it was—that they conscientiously object to allowing any of the Roman Catholic prelates to sit on this Board, administering as it does a united system of education.

22980. Mr. Sullivan.—Can any explanation be given of the increasing numbers of protests on the part of the Presbyterian Commissioners within the last five or six years as regards the decisions of the Board?—During the last eight years there have been many questions before the Board, on which the Presbyterians took a different view from the majority of the Board, and it was very natural when they did so they should wish to state the reasons which induced them to differ from the majority.

22981. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Did not Commissioners of another denomination very often join the Presbyterian members in their protest?—Yes; the Bishop of Derry very often did.

22982. Mr. Sullivan.—Judging from the evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1854 by Archbishop Whately, Master Murphy, Dr. Denvir, and others, as to your opinion that the members of the Board agreed in principle, or believed in the possibility of a really mixed system being logically and consistently carried out?—I think so.

22983. Notwithstanding the evidence in 1854?—I think so.

22984. It was stated to the House of Lords Committee by Master Murphy, a member of the Board, that he would not fit one moment think of sending his child to a Protestant school. Have you known any Commissioners or leading officers of the Board ever do otherwise than what Master Murphy stated he would do with respect to his own children?—I take it he granted that what Master Murphy meant was, that with regard to middle-class education, he, as a Roman Catholic gentleman, on the whole would rightly prefer sending his son to a Roman Catholic classical boarding school rather than send him to a school that was under Protestant management. I think that is what he meant.

22985. You think what he said had no reference whatever to the system administered by the National Board?—I think it was an entirely different question he was considering. I think he spoke with reference

to middle-class classical education carried on in middle-class schools, and that he did not at all imply that he, as a Roman Catholic, disapproved of a Catholic attending a National school where he would be taught, not by a Catholic, but by a Protestant who acted with perfect impartiality between Catholic and Protestant. In the latter case a child lives at home, his domestic life is carried on entirely in his father's house. In the case of a public middle-class school, a child is taken away entirely from the father's home, and is placed under a teacher, and lives entirely in the teacher's house, and I can well conceive that both Protestants and Catholics might, on the whole, prefer very much that their children should be brought up in boarding schools in which the teachers were of their own persuasion. I don't take that view myself, but I am quite sure great numbers of most excellent people are of that opinion—that it is greatly preferable the education of young men of the middle and upper class ought to be given in public boarding schools, where the teachers are of the same persuasion as the parents.

23994. The Chairman.—Did the Commissioners ever take into consideration what steps would be necessary to give practical effect to Mr. Childers' Fortescue's letter as to establishing a new class of boarding schools?—They confined themselves very much to considering the plan in general, and having on the whole approved of the general scheme they waited until Government should decide whether they would grant a sum of money for the purpose, and then intended to draw up—assuming the grant of public money was given for the purpose—a plan for carrying Mr. Fortescue's scheme into effect.

23997. Had they been moving on the subject after they received that letter?—They had.

23998. Did they hold any meeting on that subject after the letter had been sent approving the proposal contained in Mr. Fortescue's letter?—I don't think they did. It was after they consulted on the subject of the letter, and on the whole approved of its contents. I don't think they had any further consultation on the subject.

23999. Do you recollect whether many meetings were held on the subject before the answer to Mr. Fortescue's letter was determined on?—There were several. There was a great deal of discussion on the subject.

24000. After the answer had been sent to Mr. Fortescue did any further communication take place between the Irish Government and the Board on the subject?—Not with the Government, but we signified to the succeeding Government—Sir Lord Mayo. We drew his attention to the fact, that we had approved of Mr. Fortescue's letter, and we consulted him whether upon the whole he would think it desirable to carry the project of that letter out. There was very little correspondence on the subject. I wrote to Lord Mayo to remind him that we had decided in favour of the letter, and suggested to him the propriety of his considering whether it would be desirable to carry the contents of that letter into effect.

24001. Did he instruct you as to whether the Government desired you to pursue the subject further?—He did not.

24002. Did the subject drop from that time?—Yes. We sent in our estimate with regard to it, and that estimate was not introduced into the estimates for the year, and Government seem not to have thought it desirable to furnish the means of carrying Mr. Fortescue's letter into effect.

24003. Could you put to me a copy of the estimate you forwarded to the Chief Secretary, showing the total expenses and the various items?—Yes, my Lord. It is contained in the parliamentary paper I have here furnished as a return in answer to an Order of the House of Commons, 20th July, 1867.

24004. Do any of the persons connected with the Central Training School here receive pay from the Science and Art Department?—The teacher of the Normal school does. The professors do not receive anything.

23995. Does the school itself receive assistance from the Science and Art Department?—Some of the teachers receive assistance.

23996. Are you able to state whether any of the individual teachers receive money from the Science and Art Department themselves, or whether it is carried to the credit of the Board?—It is not carried to the credit of the Board. They receive it themselves.

23997. Now, Mr. Casale.—Do you think it advisable that persons in the pay of the State should receive remuneration from two different departments for the same thing?—I think, that in case we were unable to pay adequately for education of that kind, and that the State under some other agency offered to pay more generously for it, that it would not be wrong in us to allow the teacher to receive both the small compensation we give for it, and the more adequate sum that is given otherwise.

23998. Would there not be a difference in such cases between model schools, where you profess to supply everything, and ordinary National schools, where the teacher employed his spare time in doing more than you require of him?—I think a distinction ought to be drawn between the two cases; but, I think, it is very possible, that in most cases there might be nothing unwise in allowing the teacher to receive on very small compensation, as I believe it to be, for teaching that subject, and the more ample compensation the State gives under another form.

23999. Now, Dr. Wilson.—Is there not an additional stimulus given to teachers and scholars, and is there not work done owing to this grant-in-aid, which your Board could not undertake to supply?—I think so.

24000. The Chairman.—Are the classes and studies carried on in the model schools in connexion with the Science and Art Department, carried on to improve the teachers in training, or for the improvement of the ordinary pupils in the practicing schools?—For the improvement of the pupils.

24001. Has not that a tendency to convert primary schools into middle schools?—Not more, my Lord, than I think is desirable. I think that so long as the peculiar functions of a primary school are fully carried out, that it is very desirable there should be a somewhat higher education given to a more advanced class in our schools, especially the model schools, and in a considerable number of the larger and better National schools throughout the country.

24002. With regard to the complaints made by the ordinary masters of the insufficiency of their salaries at the present time, do you consider that their complaints are well founded?—I think that the teachers of Ireland are, on the whole, inadequately paid. Their salaries have been much increased, no doubt, of late years, but still they fall short of what one would desire them to be.

24003. Do you consider that to be the case with respect to the teachers in the first and second class as well as with respect to the teachers in the third class?—I think the teachers in the first class are tolerably well paid; the second class also tolerably paid, but still I think it would be desirable that a higher payment should be given to the best of our teachers than is given even in the first class or second class.

24004. What is the lowest salary which you would consider as a sufficient salary for a teacher who is second of third?—I should think it very desirable that a person who is second of third should have at least £20 a year. I should think it very desirable that the probationers and the teachers in the lower grade of the third class should not receive so large a sum as would hold out an inducement to managers to appoint favourites of their own to those situations, and that if you paid them much more than about £20 a year it might hold out too strong an inducement to managers to appoint persons not quite worthy of the situations.

24005. Then at the present moment you would not be prepared to recommend an increase beyond £30 a year?—Not a larger increase. I think you ought to consider the probationers and second grade of third as nothing more than apprentices. Every person who is

Feb. 13, 1868.

—  
Ralph Haw.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

Feb 15, 1869,  
 Right Hon.  
 Alexander  
 Mackenzie.

at all fit to become a teacher can, with ease, if he is attentive to his studies, rise to be at least first of third. The great object ought to be to make every situation as high as first of third and upwards as good as well can be, but with respect to those below, not to pay them more highly than they are at present paid.

24006. If the salary of the lowest class—namely, that of second of third, was increased, would it be reasonable for the State to stipulate, on the other hand, that no person should be allowed to continue more than a certain number of years as a teacher if he failed to rise above that class?—I think it would be perfectly fair that the same rule we enforce with regard to the probationers should extend in the second year to the teachers that are in the second grade of the third, and to say that unless they rose to the first grade of third they should be removed from our service.

24007. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you consider, from the experience you have had here, that the average teacher of Ireland would regularly rise to first of third?—With great ease. I believe that a person who does not rise to first of third is either incompetent from want of talent as a teacher, or that he must be a lazy, idle man.

24008. There would be no danger in putting the standard as high as that?—I think none whatever. I think it would be very desirable.

24009. Mr. Deane.—Do you consider that the grafting of agricultural education upon literary education has on the whole been beneficial?—I think so far as it has gone it has been very beneficial. It has fallen very far short of what the friends of agricultural education expected at first. It has fallen short of it in this country, and I believe in almost every other country where the experiment has been made I believe as far as it has gone it has been highly beneficial, and I am sure it might be carried on to a far greater extent than it has been.

24010. Do you think it desirable it should be still further extended?—A great deal further; instead of having only 129 schools.—I think that is the number in which agricultural instruction is provided—together with literary instruction, we ought to have, and could have, if we had the means of carrying out the experiment successfully, about 500 schools throughout our 5,000 schools, in which agricultural should be thoroughly united with literary education.

24011. Then, in extending the number of these schools, would you propose to extend them downwards, if I may so say, rather than upwards—would you increase the number of ordinary agricultural schools, or the number of the larger establishments?—I think on the whole we ought to continue our larger establishments as much as possible, to a certain number that might exhibit specimens of agriculture on a large scale, and above all that would furnish awards to the teachers and pupils in the smaller schools. The great thing would be to multiply, as far as we reasonably could, the number of small agricultural schools.

24012. Do you consider the fact of holding a small portion of land, upon which to exemplify the modes of scientific agriculture for the pupils, is likely to interfere with the literary efficiency of the school, by withdrawing the teachers' attention too much from the literary department?—I think not. I think that in the case of all those teachers who are plain, sensible men, without much talent, they would be able to carry on the common National schools as literary schools very effectively, and at the same time attend to the cultivation of their little farms. I think that the men who are decidedly intellectual would find it to their advantage, and would infinitely prefer cultivating their own minds rather than their little farms, and such persons as these ought not to be urged or encouraged much to attach farms to their schools; but the great bulk of our teachers are, and always will be, plain, sensible, homely people, and they would in most cases be able to carry on the National schools very effectively, and at the same time attend to a garden and two or three acres of land attached to their schools.

24013. Do you think it would improve the status of the individuals, their comforts, and, perhaps, their respectability, by giving them the means of employment at all times; and lessen their inducements to go about to public-houses?—It would in every way conduce to the respectability and to the improvement of their habits.

24014. Would any great difficulty be likely to arise from a teacher holding land, from the possibility of his being removed, as every teacher is liable to be removed at the will of the manager or patron of the school?—There would be a difficulty about that wherever the teacher had his little plot of ground, and was removed, or wished himself to get a better school. There would be some difficulty about giving him compensation for his improvements, and transferring the place to his successor.

24015. Do you think it would be possible, and if possible, desirable that the Board, before taking any school on its list of agricultural schools should insist upon there being a specific preliminary agreement with regard to matters of that sort, entered into between the teacher as tenant and the owner of the land he was going to farm?—It would be absolutely necessary.

24016. Do you see any practical difficulty in the way of drawing up a preliminary agreement that might meet every case that could arise?—I don't see any insuperable difficulty. The great difficulty I can see is working the thing would be to get a sufficient number of small pieces of land attached to the schools, and which would necessarily form part of the school premises. It might be very difficult in a great number of places, and, therefore, it would be a very silly thing for us to attempt to make it anything like a universal rule that there should be a school farm attached to every school.

24017. Lord Clonbrock.—In case of such an arrangement as we suggested, would it not be absolutely necessary for the Board to have an Inspector who would go down in case of the removal of a master and fix at once the amount of compensation to be given to the master going out?—I suppose the Agricultural Inspector would be of great use in settling matters of that sort.

24018. For the Agricultural Inspector to settle matters upon an inspection of the land that was about to be given up?—I think that might be done.

24019. Mr. Deane.—Do you consider the amount of agricultural inspection you have at present for the number of agricultural schools in existence sufficient, or would it be sufficient in case the number was increased to the extent you contemplate?—It is quite inadequate even for our present number of agricultural schools. It would be utterly inadequate in case the number was extended.

24020. Has it ever occurred to you that it would be possible to combine duties, in the cases of the agriculturalists at the principal establishments—such as Cork and Limerick—so as to make them both superintend the farms, with stewards under them, as they now have, and in addition take charge of a certain district or sub-districts under the direction of the Agricultural Head Inspector?—I think that plan would work exceedingly well. We are now making an experiment of that sort at Cork. We have sent Mr. Boyle to the head department at Cork. We intend he should have a skilful young steward under him, able to attend to all the details, which he himself would be enabled fully to attend to while visiting the surrounding group of schools. I am sure he would be able to combine the two duties very well. Probably the performance of the one duty would fit him the better for the performance of the other.

24021. Do you think that could be extended to other places where it might be deemed necessary to have extra inspection for such schools?—I have no doubt if it succeeds at Cork, as I confidently believe it will, we might adopt a similar plan in other places.

24022. And that might be done without any great increase of expense?—Certainly.

Feb. 15, 1889.

Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

24033. Are you personally acquainted with the working of the Belfast model farm?—I am not. We have always found it has been one of the most expensive of our agricultural establishments.

24034. I suppose you are aware it has been a very losing concern from first to last?—A very losing concern. The land is very unfavourable for general agricultural purposes. It is a very stiff clay, fitted for making bricks. It requires a great deal of expenditure to bring it to anything like a state of good cultivation. From that circumstance—and, perhaps, from others—it has been a losing concern.

24035. The rent is very high?—Very high, being in the neighbourhood of one of the largest towns in Ireland.

24036. Are you of opinion that any model farm should be retained, where it seems practically impossible to make ends meet?—Though I think the great object of the model farms under the Board is to train agriculturalists, yet certainly it is exceedingly desirable there should not only be good places for the education of future farmers, but also that the farms should be remunerative. I think the public always look with just suspicion upon every agricultural experiment, where there is a dead loss.

24037. The land of the farm at Belfast being what it is, do you consider there is any sufficient quantity of land in Ireland of about the same kind and quality, to make it at all desirable that that farm should be retained as an example of the proper mode of tilling that sort of land?—I don't think there is.

24038. Do you think it would be in any way injurious to your agricultural system if that establishment were to be altogether given up as a model farm?—We thought when urged very much by people in Belfast to have an agricultural school in their immediate neighbourhood, it would be a very great advantage to have the teachers and the pupil-teachers, employed in the model school, boarded and lodged at the farm, and that the pupil-teachers should be able to see the improved mode of agriculture carried on at the same time that they were receiving superior literary education.

24039. Is it not a fact that the farm being at a distance from the model school, no practical instruction in agriculture can be given to any except a very small class, those who may happen to be resident pupils, and a certain number of teachers in the model school?—That is so.

24040. Mr. Wilson.—Is it your opinion it would have been possible to get in the neighbourhood of Belfast sufficient quantity of land for the model farm on more moderate terms?—No, I think we got it cheap. It was rather a good bargain when we got it.

24041. Lord Clonbrock.—Don't you think the fact of a model farm not paying its expenses, is hostile to your system of agricultural instruction, inasmuch as it is apt to throw discredit in the eyes of the public upon the system of agriculture pursued?—No doubt, that is so.

24042. Mr. Dease.—At one time there was a good deal of public disapprobation of this agricultural system. Are you of opinion that the system is working at present better than it was working some few years ago?—It is working a great deal better now. The farms are in far better order. They are under our own management. If we lose a little we gain a good deal, and there is a good deal of improvement going on since Mr. Baldwin was placed at the head of the agricultural department.

24043. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In reference to a statement made on Saturday with regard to small schools in the south and west of Ireland under Protestant management in connexion with the Board, do you believe they are numerous as a class?—They are increasing.

24044. Can you say, exclusively of cities, how many such schools in the south and west are under Protestant management and Protestant teachers?—I can't say off-hand; but of this I am sure, that the only way in which the 1,500 or 1,800 Church Education schools,

which now exist in Ireland, will ever come to adopt the National system, and receive the great benefits of the parliamentary grant, is by our giving modified aid to such of these schools as apply for assistance.

24045. I don't refer so much to projected action as to the matter of fact. Is it not the fact that the number of such schools, exclusive of cities, is extremely small?—I believe the number is still small.

24046. Is it not a matter of fact, that in almost every National school in the west and south-west of Ireland, exclusive of cities, a Protestant minority is found in National schools?—The Protestant minority in National schools is very small in the south, middle, and west of Ireland.

24047. But it is found in each school?—The number is very small. Out of the 330,000 Protestants sprinkled throughout the Roman Catholic provinces of Ireland, there are only about 18,000 in our schools, and the average attendance is only about 8,000.

24048. Are you aware whether it is the fact or not that in each school a small minority is to be found?—Not in each school.

24049. In nearly every school?—No. Of the National schools in the three Roman Catholic provinces of Ireland there are about one-half of the schools in which you will find a sprinkling of Protestant pupils, varying in number from two or three to eight or nine. In the North of Ireland the noted attendance is much larger both on the part of Protestants and Catholics in those schools where the majority are of the other persuasion.

24050. Lord Clonbrock.—Do I rightly understand you to say that in half the rural schools in the south and west you will find Protestant minorities?—I think so. Out of the 915,000 pupils attending National schools I believe there are about 500,000, a majority of 160,000 that are attending mixed schools. Of these a very large number are in the Roman Catholic provinces.

24051. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In stating the proportion of Roman Catholic teachers in the model schools throughout the country a few days ago, what number did you mention?—I understand there are 74 Roman Catholics, and the remainder of about 194 are Protestants.

24052. Are you aware that according to a late return of the total number of head masters, there were but one Episcopalian, but there were fifteen Roman Catholics, and eleven Presbyterians?—I am aware the majority of the principal teachers are still Roman Catholics, but what I wished to mention was, that of the whole body, 194 principal and assistant teachers, only 74 are Catholics, while, as we all know, four-fifths of the National teachers of Ireland are Roman Catholics.

24053. Is not the number of Roman Catholics ninety-five instead of seventy-four?—Seventy-four is the number that was given to me when I was inquiring about it.

24054. And of the head mistresses seven are Established Church, two Presbyterians and nineteen Roman Catholics?—I think that is very likely. I spoke of the teachers altogether, principal and assistant.

24055. So that the large number given to other denominations is connected with the assistants?—No doubt, the majority of the principal teachers, both male and female, are, I believe, Roman Catholics.

24056. Sir Robert Kane.—Do you think that the comparatively small number of Roman Catholics in the lower ranks of the teachers of the model schools, arises from Roman Catholics having, been of late years deterred from accepting these situations owing to ecclesiastical penalties?—I do not; I do not think that hitherto the Roman Catholic teachers have been prevented practically from accepting positions in the model schools on account of the recognition of their position to their attending these schools; I believe the proportion now is very much the same proportion that existed before the prohibition in 1862.

24057. Then what may be the reason of the remarkable predominance of Roman Catholics in the higher

Feb. 15, 1869.  
Right Hon.  
Alexander  
Macdonnell.

rank of the service, and such a marked predominance of other than Roman Catholics in the lower ranks?—A very large proportion of the model schools as you know are in Ulster, which is in a great degree Protestant, and especially in those parts of Ulster where the Protestant population predominates. But wherever there is a school in the Roman Catholic part of Ulster or in the Roman Catholic provinces of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, it is natural the majority of the head teachers should be Catholic.

24048. Do you think these circumstances explain the difference?—Not entirely; I think it depends chiefly upon the circumstances that so large a proportion of the schools are placed in the Protestant parts of Ulster.

24049. That might appear to explain the fact of the majority of Protestant teachers in the schools generally; but do you think it explains the fact of the large majority of the head teachers being Roman Catholic?—It is certain you must have one Roman Catholic teacher in every model school in Ireland, because everywhere there is a large Catholic population. Whereas in the south of Ireland, where there are very few Protestants, it would be very unusual to be appointing Protestant principal teachers, and yet it would be very wise and just, even in those model schools, although but a small number of Protestants attend, to appoint some Protestant assistant teachers.

24050. Mr. Stokess—Is it the intention of the Board to maintain the rule that in every department of every model school there should be a teacher of some grade or other professing the Catholic religion?—I think it would be desirable, where fit Roman Catholic teachers could be got, that in almost every model school and in those should be a Roman Catholic teacher in each department, both male, female, and infant, because in every part of Ireland there is a large Catholic population.

24051. Are there not some exceptions of that rule in practice?—I have no doubt there are some exceptions. It is very difficult to carry it out completely, but there ought to be a desire to have a Roman Catholic teacher in each department of a model school where there was a large Catholic population in the neighbourhood of the school.

24052. May not all the teachers, except the female monitors, be brought from a distance?—They may be brought from a distance, and often are. I think there has been a tendency to give somewhat of a preference to a distinguished teacher who belongs to the district in which the model school is placed.

24053. But the portion of a model school in Ulster surrounded by a Protestant population would offer no difficulty to the appointment of a Catholic teacher coming from a distance?—No.

24054. Have you followed the public utterances of the Roman Catholic bishops on this question of elementary education?—Not very much; I don't pretend to be intimately acquainted with all their views on this subject.

24055. Is it any part of the impression upon your mind in reference to the matter, that the Roman Catholic bishops have changed the position which they occupied in reference to elementary education?—I think that at the commencement of this National system the Roman Catholic Church was a great deal more favourable to the National system than it is now. I think the opposition to it has increased very much since the lamented death of Archbishop Murray and Archbishop Croke.

24056. Did not the institution of the National Board result from the inquiry made by a Royal Commission in 1864 and 1825?—Chiefly from the inquiry of 1825. There was an inquiry in 1825, in which the late Mr. Blake took an active part. After that came the celebrated Committee of the House of Commons in 1828. The next step was Lord Stanley's letter, which was entirely founded upon the report of the Committee of 1828.

24057. Do you remember the terms of the petition presented by the Most Rev. Archbishop Murray and other Roman Catholic bishops to the House of Com-

mons in 1824, which is understood to have led to the inquiry started in that year?—I remember seeing the document.

24058. Allow me to read some passages from it for you.—

"Extracts from Petitions presented to the House of Commons by the Most Rev. Archbishop Murray and other Roman Catholic prelates in 1824.

"That in the Roman Catholic Church the literary and religious instruction of youth are universally combined, and that as systems of education which separates them can be acceptable to the members of her communion; that the religious instruction of youth in Catholic schools is always conveyed by means of catechetical instruction, daily prayer, and the reading of religious books, wherein the Gospel literally is explained and inculcated; that Roman Catholics have ever considered the reading of the sacred Scriptures by children as an inadequate means of imparting to them religious instruction, as a usage whereby the Word of God is made liable to misinterpretation, youth exposed to misapprehension of its meaning, and thereby act unwisely in forming in early life impressions which may afterwards prove injurious to their own best interests as well as to those of the society which they are destined to form. That schools whereof the master professes a religion different from that of his pupils or from which such religious instruction as the Catholic Church prescribes for youth is excluded, or in which books and tracts not sanctioned by it are read or commented on, cannot be resorted to by the children of Roman Catholics, and that threats and rewards have been found equally unavailing as a means of inducing Catholic parents to procure education for their children from such persons or in such schools; that any system of education incompatible with the discipline of the Catholic Church or superintended exclusively by persons professing a religion different from that of the vast majority of the poor of Ireland cannot possibly be acceptable to the laity, and must be in its progress slow and unimproved, generating often distrust and discord, as well as a want of that mutual good faith and perfect confidence which should prevail between those who receive benefits and those who dispense them."

Are not these statements perfectly conformable with the attitude now assumed by the Roman Catholic prelates?—Precisely so. I was aware that was the case, and that, in the abstract, the Roman Catholic Church all through, both before and after the establishment of the National system, much preferred the notion of a strictly denominational education. They found that it was impossible to obtain denominational education—they found a system of education called the National system established in 1831, and I believe they were extremely pleased for many years with it and to a great degree satisfied with it, though it never came up entirely to their wishes, any more than, I dare say, the National system comes up to the expectations of our Protestant theologians, who would much rather have a scriptural system established if they could. I believe what has taken place is that, whereas for the first fifteen years after the establishment of the National system the Roman Catholic Church was, on the whole, very well satisfied with the practical working of the system, they have, during the subsequent fifteen or more years, become gradually more and more dissatisfied to it.

24059. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Is it not the fact that for years Archbishop Murray and Dean Moyer were as friendly to the system professing to be a mixed system of education, as any other Commissioners were?—They were very favourable to it, and worked it with perfect justice.

24060. Mr. Stokes—Do you remember the resolutions presented to the Board in April, 1850, by Bishop Haly?—I do not.

24061. It is not within your recollection that Bishop Haly in that document, stated that he had "become recently aware that the rules of your Board now applicable to what you term 'non-vested schools,' afford, under Protestant patronage, such facilities for proselytism, as to render them unsafe for Catholic children to resort to," and he expressed his "surprise and regret that you should have broken faith with the earliest supporters of the Board, and justified to our Catholic population, the distrust and suspicion with which they regard any act of the Government, which, with the

apparent design of benefiting them, interfere with their education in religion?—I don't recollect he did so. I know that complaint has often been made.

24062. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is there any foundation for it?—I think that a great number of very able Roman Catholics thought that we had departed somewhat from the letter and spirit of Lord Stanley's original letter, in making certain concessions, as they were called, to the Protestants of Ireland, but I am sure, that whatever may be thought of those concessions, they have worked very little real injury to the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

24063. Mr. Wilson.—Those concessions were equally available to Roman Catholics as to Protestants?—Some of those concessions, I believe, the Roman Catholics would now be very sorry to see withdrawn.

24064. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Did not the Protestant and Catholic Commissioners consent in the statement, that those concessions were not departures from the fundamental principles of the system?—The feeling of the Commissioners at the time of the junction of the Presbyterians was, that on the whole no change of system had taken place. It was more a declaration of the general principles of the Board, than any change of system whatsoever.

24065. Sir Robert Knute.—So far as you are aware of the attitude taken by the Roman Catholic episcopacy of Ireland on the subject of education, do not their claims extend to university and secondary education, just as much as to primary education?—Entirely so, I understand.

24066. Is it not a claim in principle that the whole education of the laity of their Church should be carried on in every respect under the exclusive direction of the ecclesiastical authorities?—So I understand.

24067. And the claim with regard to primary education, conveyed in the extract from the petition which has been read by one of the Commissioners, is only an expression of that general claim in reference to that particular department of education?—Yes.

24068. Rev. Mr. Currie.—Is it not wise that all such questions should be left to be settled between the Roman Catholics and their own clergy; that the State should leave such questions to themselves to settle, without interfering at all?—I am not prepared to say so.

24069. Do you think the function of the State should be to interfere between the Roman Catholic laity and their clergy?—I think the function of the State should be to judge whether the denominational system of education, or a system of united education, is desirable for a country circumstanced as Ireland is,—that the State has not only a right to do so, but is bound to do so, and that we have been saved from innumerable evils by the State wisely and justly undertaking to pay for the united education of Protestants and Catholics who choose to be educated together; we will pay for that education out of the taxes of the State that are paid by Christians of every

denomination, and we will not pay any money for denominational schools.

24070. I understood you to have alluded on former occasions that if four-fifths of the people were so obedient to those who direct them in these matters that they could not avail themselves of the system laid down, it would be wise on the part of the Government to reconsider their plan, and to try and give them the means of education more or less on their own plan?—I should myself, speaking as a citizen, do everything I possibly could, consistently with my notions of justice, to meet the wishes of four-fifths of my fellow-countrymen; but if I found that the wishes of those four-fifths, if carried out, would be utterly destructive of their well-being, and of the whole community, I should resist them.

24071. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Can you say as a matter of fact that four-fifths do acquiesce in these proposals?—I am far from thinking so.

24072. Have not committees of both Houses of Parliament sat on this education question and resolved upon a united system?—Yes.

24073. Has there been any hint on the part of any of them that there should be a departure from that principle of continued united education for this country?—I believe the more the subject has been discussed that good and sensible men have become more and more impressed with the necessity of maintaining a united and unsectarian system of education in Ireland, and resisting the attempts to have a purely denominational system established in its place.

24074. With diversity of opinion on the subject amongst the Roman Catholic portion of the community, should you think the State justified in siding the views of the bishops in opposition to the view of the people on the subject?—I am not prepared to answer that question.

24075. Bishop of Meath.—Knowing as you do the opinions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of this country, and believing as you do what the opinions of the Roman Catholic laity is, do you think that the present system of united education, as administered by the Board, ought to be maintained?—I am clearly of opinion that it ought to be maintained, and that it still is regarded by the Catholic people of Ireland very much in the same way as I have already mentioned to the Royal Commissioners, it was regarded by that good and good man, Archbishop Murray. He has said more than once to myself, that though the National system was not a system that seemed to him to be perfect, or the one that he, if he had the power, would establish, yet that he considered it the greatest blessing that had ever been conferred upon the people of Ireland by the English Government.

24076. But taking the existing state of things—not transferring ourselves to Dr. Murray's day, do you believe the system ought to be maintained?—I do; I feel that as strongly now as I did when Dr. Murray spoke those words.

#### J. LOWRY WHITTLE, Esq., sworn and examined.

J. Lowry Whittle, Esq.

24077. Judge Morris.—You are a barrister?—Yes.

24078. And a Roman Catholic by religious profession?—Yes.

24079. Have you considered the question of the National system of education in Ireland?—Yes, I have to some extent. I have not had much opportunity of observing its working personally, but I have considered it a good deal with reference to the policy of the Roman Catholic Church, and the question of university education led me into a good deal of investigation as to the other question of primary education.

24080. Have you had many opportunities of collecting the opinions of the Roman Catholic laity on the subject?—I have continually for years had my attention drawn to the question generally. I have conversed with Roman Catholics continually on the subject, and sought their opinions about it whenever I had an opportunity.

24081. Have you formed any opinion as to whether the National system of education was one that was much valued by the Roman Catholic laity?—All my inquiries on the subject led me to the conclusion that the laity generally attached a great deal of importance to the system—believed that it was a very great boon to the country. They felt a good deal of difficulty as regards the position of the Roman Catholic clergy on it—the position which a large portion of the clergy, especially at later times, have taken up towards it, was a matter which I have constantly discussed with them. The expressions which I have constantly heard were to the effect, that if the priests could only be reconciled to it, everything would go well. That seemed to be the constant source of regret, that the priests did not work with the system as well as my interlocutors would like from their own experience of it.

24082. Are you under the impression that the sys-

Feb. 14, 1865.

J. Lowry  
Whitlie, esq.

tion is favourably considered even yet by the Roman Catholic body as far as you are conversant with it, or by at all events, a great number of the Roman Catholic body?—Yes, I think so. I think that the feeling as far as I have been able to observe amongst Roman Catholics amongst my own profession for instance, and amongst others whenever I had an opportunity of conversing on the subject, was that the object of the friends of Ireland should be to convince the clergy personally, so as to get rid of what they consider unreasonable objections to the present system, and that to maintain the present system in its integrity was a most desirable object. That is always the impression which what they have stated to me left upon my mind as to their conviction.

24083. Well then, if that be so, how do you explain the present very great opposition that has sprung up now, or lately sprung up, against the National system of education?—We must consider the sources of that opposition. The expression of that opposition comes chiefly from the clergy and the Roman Catholic episcopacy, and from a certain portion of the members of Parliament, as well as from a certain portion of the public men who are more or less identified with them. The policy of the Roman Catholic Church for some years has been to group education everywhere, to take the entire control of education into their own hands, and in Ireland their power, and their own traditions and the hold which they have upon the people give them opportunities for that which they have not in other countries. They have been endeavouring recently to use these advantages to the very utmost—to take the whole control of popular education into their own hands if possible. I attribute it to what is popularly called, for want of a better term, Ultramontane influence in the Church, combined with the anti-state feeling in the country. The national feeling of the country has for many years looked with suspicion upon anything emanating from the Government. The fact of the State having anything to do with the National Board has been from the commencement a difficulty for the National Board. Thus everything that can be represented as coming from the State, stands at a certain disadvantage in this country on account of old traditions and old associations. The clergy partly share in that feeling—the lower ranks of the clergy—and the higher ranks of the clergy, anxious from their particular views to take advantage of everything to secure their own power, have I think acted upon and made use of that feeling, so as to produce this opposition which you speak of at the present time.

24084. Are you aware from any public documents of the claim that is asserted by the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland as regards the education of the people?—I have seen many statements on this matter. There is a letter from the Irish bishops to Mr. Cardwell in 1860, and it is about the most complete summary of their views that I know of. The claim is plainly put forward in the persons of the bishops. It amounts to a claim to the control of the education of the people in all matters—practically, it is admitted, in everything. The way it is generally put is to control them in all matters affecting faith and morals, but it is stated by the more candid advocates of that view, and admitted—as of course it must strike anybody acquainted with religious documents that it must be—that there is no production of human intellect, no operation of human intellect, that cannot be regarded as having some effect upon the question of faith and morals, in one way or another. Therefore, the more outspoken advocates of the claims of the clergy will admit that they must have an absolute authority over all branches of education.

24085. Then possibly we might take Cardinal Cullen as an outspoken advocate of what is required, and I shall read you an extract from his pastoral when he was Archbishop of Armagh:—

"As to the duty of teaching faith and morals, these subjects must have a direct or indirect connection with the various departments of human knowledge, and the exercise of the Divine commandment must certainly extend to the

supervision and control of every system of education proposed or instituted for children of the Catholic Church, not in any particular department of human knowledge they should be infected with errors or opinions at variance with their faith, so that the Divine commandment given to the Apostles implies a positive duty imposed exclusively on them to teach."

Do you consider that a fair representation of the claims in the way in which you have put them—namely, that in teaching, faith and morals is undoubtedly connected with every department of human knowledge, or that, to shorten the statement very much, that they claim an exclusive authority in all teaching?—Yes, I think that is the fair inference from the passage you have read, which is one of many passages to the same effect.

24086. Well now, are you aware—I presume you have to some extent studied the subject—that the Roman Catholic Church possesses that authority which they claim here in any part of the world?—No, I do not know of the existence of such a power in any country that I am at all acquainted with. In those countries which I profess to have any knowledge of at all—Germany and France, and especially France—I know they do not possess it, though I know that on the Ultramontane side we continually find these foreign countries referred to as possessing systems of education which it would be an advantage to Ireland to obtain. Thus at page 15 of the report of the meeting of the bishops on Catholic Education, December, 1867, it is assumed that if we had the system of education existing abroad, the words of the Irish people and the words of the bishops upon that question, or those things which are assumed by the bishops to be the words of the Irish people, would be satisfied.

24087. It is essentially desirable to get the existence of the Roman Catholic clergy to work the National system?—Yes, I consider it would be a very great advantage, indeed, if they could be got to work the National system. But I think that under any circumstances we shall have that advantage to a great extent. I would not like to see the National system given up for the purpose of getting the assistance of the Roman Catholic clergy on their own terms in the education of the country. I think that the National system has so many recommendations to the people, that under the circumstances of this country the clergy must co-operate to a certain extent in carrying it out. Though they may not co-operate as fully as we would wish, they would be obliged to acquiesce in the people taking advantage of it to a great extent. You will find in the literature on the subject, which you are more familiar with than I am probably, that in many parts of the country the necessity of State aid is freely admitted—that the system of education cannot exist without the aid of the State. The only question is, upon what terms the State considers itself bound to give that aid. From what I have been able to observe of the people, they feel that this system of education is a most advantageous thing for their families. The people, from what I have heard of them, are most anxious—I have known several instances of it myself—to be allowed to send their children to these schools. They will send them, and they continually send them, and if there were no other schools in the neighbourhood a large portion of them would send their children to the National schools, in spite of any denunciations the Church might make against those schools. I do not think the clergy are in a position to offer anything like efficient schools in rivalry to the State schools, and that, not being in that position all through the country, they would be obliged to acquiesce in the people taking advantage of these schools. Then, of course, the question remains whether the designs of the clergy are so opposed to a system of good education as to justify the State in disregarding their wishes upon these subjects, and relying upon the necessity of the country to accept a State system of education. I venture to think, and I think it is the feeling that has found more or less expression amongst the Roman Catholic body, that the purpose and tendency of the predominant



party in that Church is so mischievous to education in general, that it would be the duty of the community to resist putting education into their hands. The only means at present of resisting that is through the legislative action, and unless the legislature can see its way to adopting the views or books of the Roman Catholic clergy, I do not think that they would be justified in applying the funds of the State to carry out the Roman Catholic system of education on the ultramontane theory to a large extent in this country.

24088. Now you have heard, I dare say, that a good deal of the National system, practically, is changed into a denominational system, practically?—Yes.

24089. That is, that most schools—the greater number—are confined practically to those of one religious denomination, and that, in that sense, they are denominational. If that be so, practically, what advantage do you think is to be derived from its being held to be theoretically a mixed system?—In the present position of Catholic opinion in this country, there is still a very great advantage. A Roman Catholic writes on this subject,\* who published a pamphlet some years ago, says frankly that one of the chief advantages of the National system is its non-recognition of the control that the Roman Catholic bishops claim over education, and that simply in itself is, I think, a very great thing, and one worth clinging to tenaciously. When we take into account the necessity for completeness, the craving for completeness, which the ultramontane system always exhibits, to be told that, even theoretically, the National system is beyond the control of the bishops, is an important thing indeed. The present system—assuming that it is to a large extent so denominational—is still a system—once it looks to its head—under the control of the State. It is a system the working of which is examined into by the State, and by the officers appointed by the State, irrespective of the control of the Roman Catholic episcopacy. These are facts totally alien to the ultramontane mind; and the fact that the ultramontane party in this country are obliged to cry out their attempts at propagating their opinions under such disadvantages as that, is a very great advantage to the nation, and to the Roman Catholic Church, in my mind; though, of course, the interests of the Roman Catholic Church is a secondary consideration with regard to this public matter. I think if we examined into the demands put forward we shall see that one of the most important things they ask for is the power of appointing the inspectors, more or less, and the appointing of denominational inspectors. Whilst we have the inspectors appointed, irrespective of religion, we have a most important advantage in the present system, therefore, even though the present system may be practically, in many of the schools, denominational, I think it has still advantages of very great magnitude for the future of this country.

24090. We have heard apparently very reasonable arguments in favour of a strictly denominational system, derived from the advantage of a surrounding of the religious feelings—to attach to and interweave all religious and secular subjects—in fact, that they are so intertwined that it is impossible to separate them. Have these arguments occurred to you, and if so, have you considered whether they are sound, or whether they are to be modified?—Yes, I have considered these arguments very much. They made a very great impression upon my mind when I began to investigate the subject, and I think they are likely to make a very great impression upon anybody who is earnest about religious matters, but I think, in the prominence given to them, we are liable to forget what the real purpose of education in relation to a school system should be, of course, education in a general sense, and include religious and moral training, but I think the special function of school education is to train the mental faculties, to train the judgment and the reason, and accustom them to know their own powers, and how to exercise and adapt them to the business

of life. I do not think that need be in the slightest degree antagonistic to the purest and most virtuous religious training. I do not wish in any way to see religious influence excluded from school. I think any pure or virtuous teacher, or any person who is really eager to teach, will exercise a certain amount of religious influence, a certain amount of moral training over his pupils, and that irrespective of all questions of denominationalism. But I think the very prominence given by the advocates of these changes to that question, of surroundings, shows how dangerous a body they are to give the regulation of our system of education to, because those surroundings are evidently what they intend to appeal to, not to the reasoning faculties, not to strengthen the judgment in any way, but to operate rather upon the feelings and to give them a prominence, which, in a system of school education as regards training the intellect and energies, I think would be exceedingly dangerous, and would necessarily interfere with the proper business of school education. I think that the effect of dwelling upon this, and of putting the selection of school books into the hands of those who dwell upon these accessories of education, would be to interfere with the science of education. Again, in another point of view, I think that the perpetual introduction of this detail of religious observances, will tend rather to formalize religion than to create genuine susceptibility to its influences. The class whom you should expect to see the primary school education of the country administered by would be more or less an humble class, and I would not like to see demanded of them elaborateness of detail about religious observances, which, I think, would have a bad effect upon religion, besides interfering with their other work.

24091. Well, these claims of the Irish episcopacy, which you have already referred to, you seem to think are of comparatively recent introduction?—Yes, I believe they are of very recent introduction. There was, when the National system was first established, or very shortly after it was established, a certain portion of the Irish episcopacy, who entertained very high notions of episcopal prerogative in questions of education. The chief representative of them was the present Archbishop of Tuam, but their line was not at all the line that has been since taken. The party that then opposed the National system was a minority of the Irish episcopacy, opposed to the late Roman Catholic Archbishop, Dr. Murray—a party that might be called, from high church opinions of episcopal authority, the national party. They were not a party acting as the predominant party in the Church does now, in such distinguished harmony with the views of the predominant party in the Church on the Continent—not acting with the distinctively Papal party on the Continent. But this party was in a minority for a number of years, and fought a very resolute battle against Dr. Murray's party, but on grounds, as I say, different from the present grounds, and relying much more upon the national feeling in the matter, than on the more clerical feeling of the Roman Catholic party. Since about 1852 there has been a most marked change in the character of the Roman Catholic episcopacy in this country. I should think it is chiefly attributable to the greater necessities of the Papal party and the Roman court, the larger hopes the condition of Ireland inspired in them, besides various other influences. As far as I can ascertain, as a matter of fact, the old mode of election of bishops has fallen very much into disuse, and many of the later bishops have been nominated by the Court of Rome; in regard to the mode of election—the Cardinal himself was to the See of Armagh. In these recent times, the Roman Catholic episcopacy, since Cardinal Cullen's accession to the See of Dublin, have acted in almost complete union in a particular direction, and have used much more the Continental style of expression about Church authority. As I have said, the approval of the episcopacy never was expressed absolutely in favour of this

Feb 15, 1866.

J. Lover  
Witness, esq.

\* "A Free Inquiry." By John McEvoy. Dublin: Webb, 1866. Page 76.

Feb. 18, 1869.

J. Leary  
Witness, esq.

National system; but the active and predominant party, previous to 1852, was supporting the State system of education in this country.

25102. Well, but now, assuming that the people—I mean by the people the great body of the people—back up the bishops in this view of it that they have propounded now, this extreme view we will call it if you will, which seems most legislation take in such a case?—Well, I do not think the Legislature can abdicate the functions of the Legislature. It cannot undertake to make itself merely a registry office of the views of an external body. It must exercise a certain function of judicial discretion as to its own acts. If the Legislature disapproves of the course which the people take, why it may govern the country as a sort of despotism, but it cannot abdicate, to any external body, its own functions as a Legislature. For instance, in this case. If it is so, which I do not admit for an instant, that the Irish people are united in demanding a pure ultramontane system of education, the British Parliament is not bound, merely upon that demand coming from the Roman Catholic bishops in the name of the Irish people, and supported by the tacit consent of the Irish people, to concede it. That would be making the parliamentary tribunal for Irish education the body of the Roman Catholic bishops of this country—it would be giving up the functions of the Legislature to the Roman Catholic bishops of this country. The plea, of course, put forward for such a demand is, that Parliament is Protestant, and that the people of this country in the majority are Roman Catholic. In that state of affairs the only solution for the advocates of that view is to demand distinctly the repeal of the union, if they maintain that a Protestant Legislature cannot legislate for a Catholic country, not to ask the Protestant Legislature, on account of their being incapable of dealing with certain questions, to take their decisions from an external body with no constitutional responsibility. That would seem to me to lay the foundation of the most terrible tyranny that could well be conceived. But I do not, of course, admit that that is the state of affairs in Ireland.

25103. But although you may not admit that that is the state of affairs, you are aware, of course, of the great power of the Roman Catholic bishops, aided by that of the Roman Catholic clergy of the second order?—Yes.

25104. And you are aware that they have formed very decided opinions on the subject, and, I presume, are ready to go certain lengths in support of them. How would you meet that difficulty?—As a matter of fact, I will say they have formed those opinions, and say nothing about whether they ought or ought not to have formed them. As regards the amount of political influence they are likely to bring to bear, I know their political influence is very considerable in this country, but I do not think it is likely to increase. I think it is rather likely to diminish. The great source of their political power in this country is the national antipathy between the Churches, and that the people look upon the priesthood as the only national organization left, and as consecrated by centuries, as their only protectors against troubles in old times. When the people begin to realize the present power, which they are beginning every year to do, that power will gradually diminish, and I think there are indications that the clergy themselves feel that it will diminish. The French anxiety they show to take advantage of the present power convinces me that they feel it will not be very long left them in this country. Then the anxiety of Parliament to meet this question is due not so much to a fear of that power, as to a recognition of the power of the Roman Catholic people here, as to a feeling that they ought to do what is right by the Irish people. That is the great source of danger to this system, that the most of the English politicians will think that they ought not to withhold from the Irish people what they want. What I am anxious, and those who think with me are anxious that they should see is, that it would be merely giving the Irish people a thing that they do not ask for, though it is asked in

their name, and which is sure to be most mischievous to them in the long run. The parliamentary power of the bishops at present is, in certain phases, very limited, but it is not sufficient to control the Legislature, if the Legislature understands that it is the power of the bishops and the clergy, and not the actual choice of the people themselves. From the peculiar circumstances of the country, the political power of the Roman Catholics has fallen into the hands of the clergy and the bishops alone, and therefore a large number of the Catholic members of Parliament are the mere nominees of the bishops. They are selected by conventions that are content probably to allow the bishops and clergy to be the chosen of these conventions.

25105. Lord Chesham—But how is the Parliament to get at what you suppose to be the wishes of the Irish people? If the request is made to Parliament in their name, and Parliament has no contradiction, of course they are bound to assume that the people acquiesce in it. How would you propose that Parliament should be made acquainted with the wishes of the Irish people?—Well, this very Commission was one of the means by which they are endeavouring to do that. Also the study of the actual condition of the Catholics of this country is another means. We must take into account the very small number of the Roman Catholic body, compared with the clergy and the lower classes who are likely to act and express themselves in public on this question at all. The great difficulty of the Roman Catholic body in this country is, that they are comparatively without a middle or upper class. There is a small select upper class, but there is comparatively no middle class, compared with the enormous majority of the Roman Catholic masses who actually fall into the hands of the clergy, and follow them, and are led by them.

25106. Mr. Gillies—I suppose you consider the functions of the State in a mixed community such as ours are very different from the functions of the Church. You draw a distinction between the duty of the Church and the duty of the State?—Oh, certainly. The widest possible distinction.

25107. The hope of the Church is of course to promote its own particular views, and the object of the State is to consider the wishes of the greatest number in reference to the particular object upon which it legislates?—Yes.

25108. Sir Robert Kane—You have, I suppose, made yourself acquainted with the various documents, probably, or with many of them, in which the Roman Catholic episcopacy promulgates their views upon educational questions?—Yes, I have read a good many of them.

25109. In those documents, besides touching upon educational matters, is it not usual for other subjects of public interest to be referred to and commented upon?—Yes, certainly. They generally discuss the three great political questions considered by that party—the Church, the Land, and the Education question, and also continually say other political questions that are supposed to be interesting to the Roman Catholic body.

25110. So that in your opinion, although the intervention of the authorities of the Church to direct the conduct of the people, in regard to the Education matter, is based upon the impossibility of separating the question of faith and of morals from the question of secular instruction, that does not limit or prevent the ecclesiastical authorities from discussing with equal force and equal authority questions of purely civil and political government?—No, certainly not. You will find all through the pastoral, for a number of years, the fullest discussions of political subjects. In fact, as a general rule, one would consider that the most religious matters connected with the Church, find a very small space in them. Indeed, it is only at particular periods of the year you find much space given to those things. The general tone of those pastorals is that the present prospects of the country, and the political and

social condition of the people, are of paramount importance to all the rest in it, and they accordingly lay great stress continually on those political questions in all these pastorals. I may just mention that these pastorals of the bishops have been described by a rather favourable critic, Lord Balfour, as State papers. They are rather political papers, in a certain sense, than papers on Church matters.

24101. Then is it your opinion that the bishops carry, or seek to carry, into the discussion of these purely political questions, the same authority which their sacred office gives to them in regard to the election question?—Certainly, I have not the slightest doubt that that is the prevailing purpose of the majority of the bishops, at least the tendency of their teaching, and, I may say, the purpose in many of them. The school which they specially represent at present—the majority of them represent—was specially designed to rid the Church of the control of the State in every respect.

24102. Do you mean in regard to civil government?—In regard to civil government and everything connected with civil affairs. The most distinguished exponents of these opinions of course are to be found in the magazines and pamphlets of the ultramontane party in England and in Belgium; but all the pastorals of the bishops here, without absolutely stating the propositions in the same distinct terms, fall in with the theories of those more scientific exponents of ultramontanism, and I believe have a direct tendency to train those who study by these pastorals, who take their opinions from these pastorals, to adopt, finally, the very extreme views of the Continental ultramontane party.

24103. You mentioned in answer to a previous question that the mode of election of the Roman Catholic bishops in this country had been to some extent altered of late years, and had become a matter of personal nomination by the supreme authority at Rome, independent of the form of election which formerly prevailed?—Yes.

24104. That you believe to be the case?—Yes. There is the unadmitted instance in the case of Cardinal Cullen himself being nominated to Arona. I have heard that there were also three other instances in more recent times.

24105. In these pastorals and other official documents emanating from the Roman Catholic bishops, have you found any distinct line of demarcation drawn between the authority which they derive from the supreme head of the Church, in his spiritual capacity, and the authority which His Holiness exercises as chief of the temporal government of the Roman states?—No, I think the tendency in these pastorals is to confound the civil and pontifical jurisdiction of the Pope as much as possible together. The great difficulty in dealing with these questions is the total absence of lines of demarcation of that kind. There are, for instance, certain rights of the Church—certain duties imposed upon the Church by its position as a Church, to discharge what it may consider injurious to civil society, what it may consider as having a vicious tendency, but how far that duty is to go—how far individuals are to sacrifice or submit their own individual opinions, and part of what they may conceive to be their rights, in deference to those denunciations of the Church, is a matter upon which conscientious Roman Catholics are left, in this country especially, quite in the dark. In countries governed directly by the canon law—there is a sort of constitutional liberty reserved within the Church to Roman Catholics, but in this country it is a fact, I believe, that the Roman Catholic Church does not consider the canon law as operative at all, so that the Church really exercises here, confessedly, a despotic power, and the Church, in my opinion, and I think I am borne out by the authorities, is really a constitutional system, but really here the authority of the Church is without any constitutional safeguard whatever. But, with reference to this episcopal election matter, a certain remnant of constitutional privilege remaining in the Irish Church, is

in itself dying out under the influence of ultramontane authority.

24106. Then you think there is nothing in the language, or in the conduct of the Irish episcopacy to protect the laity from the authority which is now exercised, or sought to be exercised, in regard to the matter of education being extended into other departments of civil government, and seeking a sovereignty of such entirely on the supreme authority of the Church?—No, nothing at all. I think the tendency is quite the other way—to lead the people to forget that there are any safeguards of the kind at all. The tendency is to lead the people to look as much as possible to the Church, and to the exponents of the Church opinions for their opinions on the subject. I find nothing in the teaching of the Church in modern times to educate the people to guard against what church history teaches us to be the natural tendency of the clerical mind, to usurp authority.

24107. From your observations and knowledge of the country, do you consider that the united system of education here, or has had, any tendency towards mitigating the state of religious excitement and religious and political discord which did unfortunately exist in this country for so long?—Well, I can hardly say I am sufficiently familiar with the schools, and with the working of them. I have met many Roman Catholics educated in those schools, and been very much gratified marked by the tone in which they spoke of their co-religionists. As far as my limited observation goes, I have known many instances, I may say, in which I thought I could trace a very much better and enlightened tone of sentiment to this National system of education; but I would rather decline to express any general opinion on the subject.

24108. Would you feel competent to express any opinion whether a system of denominational education in which the children of the different religious communities would be separately educated, and the direction of their studies controlled solely by the heads of their respective churches, that that would involve any chance of tending to make these persons in after-life consider themselves different communities, with antagonistic feelings and interests, and so tend to introduce the elements of civil discord into the country?—I have not the slightest doubt that the success of the present movement, on the part of the Roman Catholic body, in regard to education, would have that tendency; not the slightest doubt. I believe that those who are pushing it are seeking a result of that kind, which they consider necessary for their particular views. They consider that religion, as they look upon religion, is not existing in a pure state unless people are in that state of passion and earnest feeling which excludes any treaty with their neighbours differing from them in religion at all. That is the direct tendency and aim—I do not say of everybody connected with this movement—but of the thinking heads of the people who are really fanning the system which the party here are carrying out. Their object is to carry the war of religion into every department of life, and engulf everybody in the battle to the utmost.

24109. Do you think, then, that this movement in favour of denominational education is made with a view of establishing an superiority as superior in which some four-fifths of the people of Ireland would exist under the government of the heads of the Church, with powers of civil authority not derived from the British Constitution?—Yes. One of the main sources of this present agitation about education has been this, that the predominant party in the Church feel themselves losing ground all over the world—in Italy, Austria, France, and everywhere else. In Ireland they find they have a hold upon the masses of the people, but under those circumstances I have already referred to—the peculiar history of the country, and the old associations, and the habits of the people to associate them with the last remnants of their rebelliousness in old times. The clergy find that here they have such a hold upon the people as they have nowhere else; and the clerical party in the Church, and many

Feb. 15, 1869.

J. Lavery  
Witness, etc.

Feb. 18, 1868.

J. Lowry  
Whitlie sq.

enthusiastic leaders of Church opinion in this country, hope to see the day when revived and predominant ultramontanism in this country shall send forth missionaries to recover ultramontane sway upon the Continent, and in the meantime hold this country as a nursery of ultramontane action.

24110. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Freedom of education is a phrase with which you are familiar?—Yes.

24111. What is your definition of freedom of education?—I look upon freedom of education as a power of the individual to get what I consider an education free from the absolute control of any particular faction or party in the State.

24112. Is freedom of education enjoyed so long as parents are subjected to external influence—that of the clergy—and coerced to send their children to schools of which they do not approve, and to keep them away from the schools that they would prefer?—No, certainly not.

24113. If parents are not free to choose the schools for their children are there in your opinion true freedom of education?—No, I think not. One of the greatest dangers we have to guard against in Ireland is that the State should put it in the power of the clergy to practically interfere with the free choice of the parents. One of the complaints that was made in the letter to Mr. O'Connell, a complaint on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy is that the State dealt not with the bishops but with the parents of children. The bishops say "The Board condescended to treat with those who know little of the requirements of a religious education, and are incapable of resisting their power or penetrating their designs." That is their way of stating the complaint that the State looks to parents instead of looking to them, whom they consider the proper exponents of the parents' wishes.

24114. Then the State undertaking so largely to support schools by the funds of the State, you should not consider the Church entitled to control the education given by the State?—No, certainly not. I may just say as regards that, the real issue is whether the State undertaking to supply the funds and books, must exercise some judicial discretion as to whether it is a proper system of education or not, and they are not justified in delegating that function to any body external to the State.

24115. It is said that the Roman Catholic people of this country demand denominational education. You do not agree in that opinion I understand?—No.

24116. Should you deem it wise as a demand of the clergy and the bishops then of the people?—I regard it specially as a demand of the bishops, supported to a very great extent by the clergy and to some extent acquiesced in by the people.

24117. You have spoken of the tacit consent of the Irish people. Does that in any way imply acquiescence in the views of the bishops?—I do not think they understand what the views of the bishops are. They are not qualified to reason upon these subjects themselves. They have no suitable clue to speak for them, and they really do not understand what is going on. When they are asked to leave a certain school, if the parents have a good school to send them to, probably a large portion of them will go, but I think if the priests have not a good school to send them to they will stick to the National School.

24118. Is there any other reason to account for the people's silence generally?—I think there are two other strong reasons—first, that there is great distrust of the people for anything coming from the State, and I hope that is an evil that will diminish from year to year; secondly, there is a very old feeling of wishing to stand by the clergy as much as possible.

24119. Speaking of the clergy, have you any reason to believe that the second order of the clergy are not in full accord with the demands of the bishops?—I think the second order of the clergy do not enter into the romantic designs of the Ultramontane party at all. Amongst the priests, there is a very genuine national spirit, and they do not at all understand what

many of the bishops are driving at—what the episcopal party prosper are driving at. I look forward one day, sooner or later, to see, amongst the working clergy in Ireland, a very important party to support independent opinions in the Church.

24120. I think you have said that, to some extent already, the political power of the priesthood is on the decline. Do I understand you to say so?—Yes, I think so. I mean to say it shows signs of decay. I think its actual operation at present is stronger and more powerful than ever it was. Its actual operation at the last election was very great, but it is brought forward in an open way. It is exercised in a way utterly independent of lay support, which must bring about its own ruin before long. There is, in such a confession of its independence of lay support, a distrust of lay interference which leads me to the conviction that the priests themselves feel that in the present state of things their hold is likely to relax.

24121. Now, last but not this opposition, of the Roman Catholic luty, exhibited itself lately in the north and west of Ireland, as well as in the north, which may be regarded as more Protestant?—Yes. I have seen some instances of it, but I cannot say that I have observed in the north much exhibition of opinion. I am not familiar with the north.

24122. Have you found a large number of the practical Catholics of the country—men of position—ready to follow the example of the educated members of their own faith, and to break with the bishops on this subject of education?—No, I have not found many of them ready to break with the bishops on this subject of education. I do not think that many Catholics like that. I find that all I have conversed with, almost without exception, have expressed to me their strong opinion of the grievance of the action of the bishops, but I do not think, for reasons I have stated elsewhere, you will find the mass of the Roman Catholic luty disposed for a long time to break with the clergy. I should like permission to refer you to an examination of the position of the Catholic luty in a paper of mine in *Frederic's Magazine*, because I think the silence of the Roman Catholic luty has been often misunderstood in this country. It has reference specially to the question of university education, but it has a direct bearing also upon this other question.

24123. Read it, if you please?—It is published in *Frederic's Magazine*, for April, 1868, in an article entitled "How to save Ireland from an Ultramontane University," and the passage to which I wish to call your attention is the following—

"A consideration of the real position of independent Roman Catholics in Ireland will at once supply a satisfactory answer. The gentry and moneyed men of this religion are, in truth, a mere handful compared to the ignorant priest-led masses, full of all the superstitions of old persecution, of all the enthusiasm of an oppressed nationality. They are but a slight crust upon those seething billows. Too few in numbers, and too scattered to assert the leadership of their co-religionists, they are utterly powerless in any Roman Catholic movement if opposed to the priests. If they want seats in Parliament, for instance, how do they obtain them? Only by the favour of the bishops. The very instance I have already referred to in the early formation of the Catholic University illustrates this. The original laymen originally associated in the matter have been put aside, and no one has ever inspired vity. To compare Ireland to any of the Continental Catholic countries is absurd. In no country of Europe, except Ireland, is the division of credits practically coextensive with the division of classes. To reproach the small section of Roman Catholic gentry and men of education with not reaching their clergy, within their own body, is most unjust. No doubt if they could all be inspired with sufficient enthusiasm to make a stand, shoulder to shoulder, they could do great service to religion and their country; but if they were to act in such a spirit, they would show some closeness of union, more influence of purpose, and higher resolution than any similarly circumstanced class have ever exhibited. Let us go to any ordinary grand jury-box, and observe the five or six Roman Catholics to be found among its twenty-three occupants (I should say out of Ulster, for in that province we should hardly find a grand juror of this religion). One or two of these five or six are men of large estate and sound

family; the rest are men of small fortune and recent origin. What have these people to exclaim except their belonging to the rank of the crowd? They differ among each other in education, in habits, in social position, in mental structure. They are strong, but not yet of that limited heterogeneity which has been so long associated with the predominance of another Church, which is still legitimately powerful by its rank and wealth, amongst whom numbers are said to be fixed (trapping some of the strongest traditional of a hypochondriacal). It is reasonable to expect that men so circumstanced will undertake an active conflict with their own clergy? Where are they to find sympathy to support them in the combat? Certainly not among the ignorant peasantry, not among the struggling professional men who are trying to get into business through the patronage of the clergy. Are they to seek it among their Protestant neighbors who cannot comprehend the real issues, who cannot enter into their feelings as Roman Catholics? But such a course is not only irreproachable it is impossible. So small a class cannot produce within its own limits the requisite amount of thinking power, cannot acquire the learning necessary for such a conflict. It is irreproachable all the conditions that are required for the formation of a power calculated to operate effectively on public opinion. But though this class is then powerless, acting merely within sectarian limits, in conjunction with their countrymen of other sects, they become an invaluable agency. The development and complete assimilation of this class is a political point of view to the rest of the community is indispensable as a protection to the public from Ultramontane aggression. The more they are united with their countrymen of other sects, and the more complete the equality is, the more influential do they become in uprooting from the minds of the people those prejudices upon the existence of which the Ultramontane depends for their success."

24124. Then are we to take it as a matter of fact that there is a large educated class anxious to co-operate with their Protestant fellow-countrymen for the general good?—Yes, I think so.

24125. The demands of the Church at present are for the education of the people free from State control. With the Church "free" to educate what has been her fidelity and what her success in Italy, Spain, and Southern Germany, and can you state whether or not in Naples, where the power of the clergy over the people was greater than perhaps in any other country in Europe previous to the fall of the King of Naples, the percentage of the people capable of reading and writing was the smallest in Europe?—I cannot say.

24126. Do you believe this to have been the state of the case?—The richest endowments held by the Church in this country were in what constituted the kingdom of Naples. And it appeared in the census of 1864, that there the percentage of those who could neither read nor write reached the figure of 80. I find this in a pamphlet you wrote, page 25. Is that a correct statement?—Yes.

24127. When did the Roman Catholic bishops of the country begin to discover their mission as educators of the people?—The time when they put forward those prominent claims to assume the education of the people was, I think, in 1850. From 1850 to 1852 was the time their claims first came forward in this prominent way as to exercising the sole control of education.

24128. What are, and should you be disposed to recognize under any circumstances, the Church's royal rights?—I do not recognize the claims to royal rights. That is a term applied by the ultramontane advocates to what they put forward as the rights of the Church to control the action of the State. And it is variously stated in some of the controversies about Belgium, and in an instance of how curious we must be in making the language of that school in one place as applicable to another. They state that in a country where public opinion is divided to some extent, the Church might be justified in sacrificing its royal rights for the time being, in deference to the exigencies of the period.

24129. Did the Roman Catholic Church in this country even accept the united system of education, do you think?—I consider that practically it was accepted.

24130. About what time?—About 1839, I think.

24131. And so late as 1849 or 1850?—Yes; down

to 1852. Down to the Synod of Thurin it was accepted.

24132. Was it so recognized by leading ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church in this country?—Yes; Dr Murray was a member of the National Board, and I think Dr. Cady also, the Archbishop of Arragh.

24133. Do you think the people of this country may be prejudiced against the system owing to its administration by a Government Board, considering the history of the country, &c.?—Yes, I think so. I think that is one of the dangers which the Ultramontane party have taken advantage of as much as possible.

24134. Are not the prejudices of the people, so far as they exist against this system, owing more to the fact that the Board is a Government creation than to their opposition to mixed education?—I have not the slightest doubt of that. The same error is operating to some extent on the Queen's University.

24135. Have you any apprehension that if the demands of the bishops were granted, freedom of education would be interfered with?—I have the strongest apprehension of it. You will find ground for it in the measures adopted by the Church to withdraw the people, ignoring their liberty altogether, and Cardinal Cullen has himself, in a recent pastoral, told the way, and held out a sort of threat of the withdrawal of the sacraments from people participating in mixed education. He says—"Do not those authoritative words show that the parents who impute to Melchior not the bodies, like the Jews, but the souls of their children, and who expose them to lose their faith and the hope of eternal salvation are unworthy of the favor and sacraments of the Church? Do they not also prove that confessions cannot with a good conscience give them absolution as long as they refuse to fulfil their parental duty by providing a Catholic education for the offspring committed to their care?" A passage of that kind coming from an ecclesiastic in such a position as his Eminence holds, has a direct tendency to train a certain number of the people, and prepare them for the most extreme measures as soon as the authorities of the Church find themselves strong enough to use them. Dr Darcy, of Clonfert, in March, 1865, actually announced in a pastoral that those who were guilty of sending their children to the Queen's University could not be admitted to receive the holy sacraments of the Eucharist of Penance whilst they continued in their disobedience.

24136. You do not think it desirable to increase the teaching power of the Church?—No; it is a great mischief.

24137. Is it the desire of the Roman Catholic bishops to keep the Catholics separate from the Protestants in this country. Have you reason to believe it so?—Well, I do not know as to individuals. The direct tendency of the teaching would be to sever them. I think I may say that the predominant party are anxious to keep the Roman Catholics separate from the Protestants.

24138. You have, I think, emphatically said that the religious education of the people is of vast importance, and should be attended to. Whose business is it specially to attend to this department of education?—The clergy.

24139. Has not the Roman Catholic portion of the community of late years made most praiseworthy exertions on behalf of the education of the people?—Yes.

24140. In building school-houses, supplying teachers, and managing schools?—Yes.

24141. Are you acquainted with the schools of the Christian Brothers?—I have visited one, and I know some of their books.

24142. Do you know what their special function is as teachers? What is their design as teachers in the country?—I have always understood that they were intended to some extent to carry out the Church views of education in opposition to the system of National education.

24143. But having existed previous to the estab-

Feb. 12, 1889,  
J. Lowry  
Whitlock, esq.

inherent of this system of National education, are you aware that their special function was to attend to the religious education of the young?—Well, I do not know much of their early history. I only know that I find that in the country, where Christian Brothers' schools are instituted, pressure is put upon the National schools.

24144. In the case of the Christian Brothers, and the ladies devoted to the education of the people, would not their religious education be well provided for?—Yes, I should think it would.

24145. And that there is a field for them to develop their talent in that department?—Yes, I think they would be well engaged in it.

24146. Should you not suppose that the education of the youth of the country would be better attended to by that arrangement?—Yes, far better.

24147. Is it your opinion that there is a large and steadily increasing number of the intelligent and leading Roman Catholics whose views are not in accord with the bishops?—Yes, the number is increasing.

24148. Would it be just or right in your opinion for the Government of the country to aid the bishops in their efforts to debate and control the education of the people?—No, certainly.

24149. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Do you think holding the views you do with respect to the opinions of the clergy, it would be much better that our system should be one of purely secular instruction, and that the State should have nothing to do with religious instruction at all?—Well, I am not prepared to say that the State should not make some sort of provision for religious education—should not encourage religious education to some extent.

24150. Would you have the teachers give religious instruction or that the ministers of religion should give religious instruction?—Only the ministers of religion.

24151. Should the teacher be forbidden to give religious instruction?—Only as far as may be necessary to provide against proselytism. Every step should be taken to do that, but I am not prepared to lay down any general rule upon the subject. Everything in the way of protection from proselytism would be most essential to the beneficial working of the system of education, especially in this country.

24152. Is it not a fact that five-sixths of the schools of the country are under the management of the Roman Catholic priests?—I think it is not quite so much. I think it is somewhat under three-fourths.

24153. In that case does not the religious instruction and the secular knowledge of the children of the country come within the influence of the Roman Catholic priests everywhere?—Yes.

24154. Is there any means you could suggest to us by which the children could be protected from that?—No; I do not wish to see the State step in between the people and the priests, and take the people far from out of their hands; the priest exercises his authority in the parish school, but he exercises it knowing that he does so under the control of the State, more or less, and he is obliged to conform to the public and to his parish, and that is a most important thing.

24155. I do not think there has been any scheme before us that would diminish the power of the State in any of the schools—even in the supposed alteration of rules, still the State would hold the purse, and that gives the power?—I do not know what the schemes before you may be, but I know one of the schemes proposed has been the appointment of inspectors on denominational grounds.

24156. That has been suggested by one or two witnesses, but it has not been proposed?—That, for instance, I should have considered a suggestion.

24157. Can there be any necessity for appointment of denominational inspectors when the inspectors never make any inquiry about religious instruction?—I suppose the inspectors would not speak of religion at all. But I know many Roman Catholic clergy would like the denominational inspectors. This question I put much in that form to a clergyman, and he

could not give me any distinct objection for sometime; but he mentioned that one Friday the inspector happened to come round, and during the inspection he happened to eat his lunch before the pupils, and then consisted of a sandwich of some kind of meat, and he considered that that would have a bad effect before the pupils, seeing a person clothed in authority who did not comply with the provisions of the Church.

24158. Judge Morris.—With respect to the question of the Rev. Mr. Cowie, that it was only mentioned by one or two witnesses that the inspectors should be denominational, let me read this passage of Bishop McKee on the subject:—"The denominational system is the only one suited to the system of the country, the only system in harmony with the religious feelings of the people, the only system that would secure the cordial co-operation of the recognized religious teachers and the great majority of the people of Ireland; but that would require that the Board, that the training schools, that the books, that the inspectors, and the local managers, should be denominational." Now, with that passage in a report sent by that bishop to this Commission, and the voice of the bishops, do not you think that there is a demand that the inspectors should be denominational?—Certainly, from all I know outside this Commission that is one of the principles that will be proposed.

24159. You recognize that the bishop says it will never secure the cordial co-operation of the recognized religious teachers, by which he means himself and his brethren?—Yes.

24160. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Do not you think that the true remedy for the present difficulty is for the State to assume a position of this kind, that it has nothing whatever to do with anything but the secular instruction of the citizens, and for that it will pay liberally?—I do not think that would offer any remedy to the present difficulty, for I think the secular instruction is what the clergy are just as anxious to get control over as the religious instruction.

24161. Then, according to your views, it seems we must leave the people unprotected altogether; because if the State cannot interfere even to give secular instruction, it seems that we come to a dead lock, and that the whole system must cease?—I think we would come to a dead lock, were it not that the common sense of the people would supply the remedy. If the State maintains its position the people will follow it. They have something to gain in supporting the State, and they will practically relieve the State of the difficulty by supporting it, and the clergy will be compelled sooner or later to follow.

24162. I find from your description of the schools, and as we have heard it from the chief parts of the country, that three-fourths of the schools are at present in the hands of the parish priests, and that so far the schools, though called united, are denominational to a great extent, practically though not nominally?—I believe that is so from the circumstance of the population being divided so much according to religion in various districts. I still think that the control exercised by the State in this way through their inspectors, and through the action of the Board is very beneficial.

24163. Do you think that there is any expectation that the Government will abandon any part of the control it exercises through the Board or through the inspectors?—I think there is very strong hope amongst the clerical party—very strong anxiety on the subject.

24164. Lord Clonbrock.—Though this system becomes denominational in certain cases where there are priests' schools, yet do not you think it is very different if the persons administering the system, even if he administers a system confessedly denominational?—Yes, a vast difference.

24165. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Besides, in every National school under the management of Roman Catholic priests, with Protestant minorities in attendance, is there not a rule of the Board, practically a conscience clause, protecting the rights of these minori-

den t.—Yes, and I think that in itself has an immense moral effect against the pernicious influence.

24166 Mr. Gilman.—Is this rule of the Board not a great lesson of toleration, which is most important in a country like this?—Yes, I think so, and so far as my hurried observation goes, it seems to produce a very practical result.

24167 Then the protection of the Government against interference of that kind is a matter which would be altogether lost in the denominational system?—Yes.

24168 Mr. Deane.—Have you offered your evidence to this Commission as an individual Roman Catholic, or in a representative capacity?—Merely as an individual Roman Catholic, acquainted with the state of Roman Catholic opinion.

24169 Judge Morris.—But in giving your evidence you are not delegated by any body?—No.

24170 But in giving it as an individual Roman Catholic, do you believe you express the opinions of a great many educated Roman Catholics?—Yes, I have no doubt that I do, but I do not mean to say I come forward here to represent them specially.

24171 Mr. Deane.—Are you aware of any demand made by the Roman Catholic bishops in this country with regard to education, going beyond what has been already granted by the State to the Roman Catholic body there and to every religious body in England?—I think there is an enormous difference in the demands made by the Roman Catholic bishops here, because the English system is founded entirely upon the voluntary aid of the laiculate.

24172 I am speaking merely as to the influence that the clergy and the bishops exercise in this country over education. Are they demanding anything more than the Roman Catholic bishops of England already possess, a power recognised practically, under the English system?—Practically, I do not know that they are, if you make allowance for this, that they require the State here to undertake the whole cost.

24173 I speak of their demand simply as to the religious power of controlling the religious education of Catholics?—So far as I am acquainted with the English system they are not. But the English system must be considered in this way. In the first place the Roman Catholic body there is a very small body, and

its general effect upon the nation is of very small importance, and in the second place the State has adopted the denominational system there as a part of the terms upon which they obtained the voluntary aid.

24174 The Chairman.—Does the Committee of Council in England enter into any direct or official communication with the Roman Catholic bishops there with respect to their own dioceses or as a general body?—Well, I am not acquainted with the English system, but I have certainly heard that they do not enter into any communication with them as an official body.

24175 Are you aware that the organ of the Roman Catholics, dealing with the Committee of Council, is the Catholic Peer School committee?—I have heard that.

24176 Lord Clarendon.—You think that the system pursued in England, owing to the small numbers of Roman Catholics, forms no analogy to this country—that the numbers are so very different?—Yes; it is a totally different question there. They are a small sect, and, of course, in the general working of the system concessions may be made.

24177 And that system permitted in England, is permitted by no Roman Catholic country in Europe?—In all important matters it certainly is not. I may mention while on that subject that a popular mode of posing this question is to mention—and I think that even Mr. Myles O'Reilly has occasionally spoken of the foreign system of education, as if they gave the Church certain rights of which the Irish people are deprived—but when we come to discuss the question with the bishops and those who speak out their views on the subject, they admit, and there is nobody acquainted with the literature on the question, in Germany and Belgium, but will know that the Church is not at all in the position there which the bishops wish to see it in here. They are ready to claim certain things for the Church as existing here, as if these were things which the Church was finally content with in Belgium, but when they come to discuss the question of Belgium and Prussia, they at once say that the Church there is only gradually getting possession of some of its rights, so that the notion that giving the clergy anything that exists in Germany or Belgium will satisfy them, seems totally without foundation.

[Adjourned.]

# SIXTY-FOURTH DAY.—DUBLIN, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1869.

## PRESENT.

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRATON, *S.P.*  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH  
The Right Hon. Lord CLARENDON  
Sir ROBERT KANE, *P.R.*  
WILLIAM BRIDGE, Esq., *M.C.*

Rev. DAVID WILSON, *D.D.*  
Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, *D.D.*  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq.  
SCOTT NANCYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., *P.R.*

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., *Q.C.*, } *Secretaries*.  
D. E. DENNIS, Esq., }

The Right Hon. MOUNTFORT LONGFELD SWORN and examined.

24178 The Chairman.—I believe you were for some years one of the Judges of the Incorporated Estates Court in Ireland?—Yes, about sixteen or seventeen years.

24179 How long have you been a member of the National Board?—From fifteen to sixteen years—from 1853.

24180 Do you think that in the early days of the institution of the system of National Education it could have been carried on successfully if it had not been administered by a representative Board?—I think it could not. I think the adversaries would have been strong enough to destroy it—that the Board would

probably have fallen into some mistake, and also that they would not have been strong enough to resist even when they were in the right.

24181 Do you consider that it is still desirable to maintain that description of Board?—I do. I may add that its representative character has been very much increased since its original constitution. The Board has been increased in number with a view to the balance of the different religious parties.

24182 Do you consider the equality of numbers which exists between the two great divisions of religion in this country on the Board to have been satisfactory out of doors?—I think so, so far as I am able to judge.

Feb 15, 1869.  
J. Lowry  
Witness, esq.

Feb. 16, 1869.  
Right Hon.  
Mountfort  
Longfeld.

Feb 16, 1883.

Right Hon.  
Maurice  
Langford.

24183. Do you find practically that the number of twenty is too large a Board for considering the various branches which come before it?—I have not found any inconvenience to result from the number.

24184. Have you not found the members unwisely or to create uncertainty in its policy?—No, I never found that to be the case. I may add that it is an advantage, because it enables the feeling of every party in Ireland to be felt in the Board.

24185. And also of every district, the mountainous as well as the rich?—Well, that has not been looked to in the constitution of the Board, but all the members know that the poor people are the most to be considered. I do not think that there has been any regard paid to the district from which a member came. I never heard any question discussed in which a dispute could arise between the mountain and the plain.

24186. The ordinary business of the office is, we understand, practically administered by the Resident Commissioner?—A great deal of the business of the office is administered by him; but the business of the Board is administered by the whole Board, with of course considerable assistance from the Resident Commissioner, who knows more than any of the other members. But we have the power of overruling his decision, not of overruling it strictly, but of voting in the other way—and then he is in the minority. Permit me to state what I consider the business of the Board. It is to determine what officers should be appointed, what classes of officers; to appoint these officers, to regulate the duties which they have to perform, to punish them or remove them if they do not perform their duties sufficiently, to select the books which are to be read in the schools, and to determine what schools are to be taken into connexion with the Board, and on what terms. All these acts are done by the Board at large.

24187. Settling aside any question connected with religion, and considering it merely as a question of administrative regulation, do you think it better to have an office under a single head as the Resident Commissioner is, or a dual head, like, for instance, the Irish Poor Law Board?—Well, I think a single head or a head like ourselves are the best. I do not see any object in having more than one, unless you have a board.

24188. You would not advocate a second paid Commissioner simply as an improvement in the machinery of the office?—I do not think it would improve the office. It would not do much harm, but I do not think it would do much good either.

24189. Do you attach importance to the maintenance of the dual secretaries, one representing each creed?—I think it is required by the feeling of the country, but otherwise it would not be of great importance. I think it is very desirable that a person of whatever religion he is, either of the two great religions into which Ireland is distributed, should have a person with whom he could confidentially talk, and let his weaknesses be known as well as his strength, which he could not do if he had to meet a person on whom he would look as belonging to the adverse side.

24190. That any sentimental grievances may be treated in a sympathetic spirit?—Yes; and even if it is a weakness, that it may be imparted to a person who will give that sympathy.

24191. With respect to the clerks in the office, I think we have understood that persons are appointed by a competitive examination irrespective of religion?—No, not irrespective of religion generally. In most cases we select I think, whether it is what is called a Protestant vacancy or a Roman Catholic vacancy, and then we select out of the men proposed by these, by competition.

24192. Does that extend to the clerks in the office or merely to the Inspectors?—My impression is that with regard to the clerks in the office we look also to their religion to try and keep a balance.

24193. Is the balance of religion sought to be maintained amongst the clerks in the office?—We seek to maintain it, but among the Inspectors we insist on maintaining it.

24194. Have you ever considered which would have been the preferable constitution of the Board—the existing constitution, or the having as the head of the office a Parliamentary officer like the Vice-President of the Committee of Council in England?—Yes; I think our present constitution works rather better. I think that our Resident Commissioner, who is a man of considerable ability and devoted to the cause, feels himself the advantage of being surrounded by equals instead of by a Board under him to which he could dictate.

24195. You prefer the existing system to maintaining the Board as the colleague and counsel of a Parliamentary chief?—If he was to sit in Parliament he could not do his duty at the Board, and he would not have as much influence on the present Resident Commissioner, because the influence that arises from knowledge and attention to business is very great, and would be wanting then. If he did not attend in Parliament it would be giving another name and not much more.

24196. Do you think it would be an advantage if any changes made by the Board in the rules were required to be submitted to both Houses of Parliament for a certain time before they were put into execution, as is now the case of the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education in England?—No; we have a rule that is, I think, as good as that, and works better. They must be submitted to the Lord Lieutenant, and get his approbation if they are important rules. I know there are cases in which changes and things are submitted to both Houses of Parliament within a certain number of days after the meeting of the session, and I believe no member ever looks at them then. In the Landlord and Tenant Court I know we had to do that with our rules, and I have never heard that any member of either House ever read them or saw them.

24197. Is it not a great security to persons who have to deal with the system, to know that by any change in the rules being laid before Parliament, practically changes will only be made once a year, at a known time?—No; I do not think that is of very much importance. All changes are so well represented at the Board, that it is not likely that any change would ever be made which would offend a large class, and when such a change is proposed, it is brought in very slowly. We meet perhaps a dozen times a week or a fortnight's interval before the change is made.

24198. Have not the various changes which have taken place in the rules regarding religious instruction been considerably detrimental to different classes in the country?—Yes; the changes have been, I think, generally detrimental to one class.

24199. Which class?—I think many of the Protestants were displeased with the changes that were made.

24200. Which is the change to which you refer?—Some changes that were made with regard to certain schools, giving them increased privileges, and also some changes that were made requiring the parent's written consent before a child could receive any different religious instruction from his parents.

24201. Would it not have diminished the amount of ill-feeling and controversy in the country, if these changes relating to religious rules had been published, and, if needed, discussed in Parliament before they were acted on?—Indeed I do not think it would. They are discussed immediately after if they are so important enough. When I say that I do not think it would do any good, I do not think it would do any harm, for I have not the slightest objection to the change being made.

24202. When any changes in the rules are submitted to the Lord Lieutenant for his approbation, is that done formally before him in Council, or in what manner is his opinion or approbation conveyed to the Board?—It is sent to him through the Secretary—not sent to him in Council. The Council is not the Cabinet in England—a body to advise the Lord



**Lieutenant.** They do certain formal acts chiefly, and some judicial acts, but for his advice they are never called I imagine.

24213. Do you think it would be an advantage if any changes in the rules, great or small, were submitted to the Lord Lieutenant in Council in the same manner as schemes proposed by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in England are submitted to Her Majesty in Council?—Well, I see no harm in it. I do not think that it would do any good. I think they would just pass them, and it would take up some more time from the Council. I do not think they would ever object to that.

24214. Might not some advantage be obtained by such a measure, from its forcing the Irish Secretary, for the time being, to make himself personally acquainted with the changes proposed?—Yes, I think the more the Irish Secretary knows of the business the better, and it might have that indirect advantage.

24215. I presume you would not consider it desirable that any important act of the Board should be done without the full concurrence of the executive government?—Oh, certainly not, and that is provided for by our rules, which enact that no fundamental change shall take place without the consent of the Lord Lieutenant.

24216. But who is to judge what is a fundamental change—there is no separate class in your rules specified as fundamental rules?—No, but something must be left to the good sense and good feeling of the body; and, for instance, if a large body of the members thought it a fundamental change, it would be yielded to.

24217. May not grave discontent be created by what apparently is a trifling change, as well as by one of a more sweeping character?—Indeed, it would be very hard to say what change might not lead to discontent. We try to avoid it. I never heard any change objected to as a grievance to any class. I may observe that the change which the Presbyterians objected to certainly did not affect a single Presbyterian child.

24218. As many of your members live at a distance, and others are much occupied with other duties, do you think that the existing practice of the Board of meeting as often as once a week is desirable?—I think meeting less frequently would do well, but it works very well in this way: there is a great deal of formal business in which we know that no reasonable difference of opinion can exist, and we get through that; and then when there is anything of importance we adjourn it until we can get a pretty full Board, so that any member of the Board is reasonably certain that nothing on which he can have any strong feeling will be disposed of in his absence.

24219. Are the agenda papers of each meeting uniformly sent to all members of the Board some days before?—Yes, that rule of sending a programme was adopted very shortly after I became a Commissioner.

24220. Is it also the custom to send to each member a copy of the minutes of the last meeting?—Yes, that is also sent, and if any member wrote to request that a particular subject should be adjourned till he could attend within a reasonable time it is always complied with.

24221. Do you think that the existing practice affords sufficient security against the business falling into the hands of a small minority of the Board?—I do, I never heard any intimation that it had that effect.

24222. Were you a member of the Board when the rule was passed that no more monastic schools should be admitted?—No; that was passed long before I became a member.

24223. Are you aware what the reasons were which induced the Board to make that rule?—It was considered that those schools must be essentially schools for the purpose of teaching a particular religion, and they were struck off before I became a member of the Board, and the only change that was made since I became a member was to extend an indulgence to them

by allowing old monastic schools that had ceased to be monastic to come back to us again—no new schools to be made.

24224. Why was it considered that the male monastic schools were of a more denominational character than the female convent schools?—Well, I believe it was merely a balance of convenience. The female convent schools were among the best schools in Ireland, and it was a destructive thing the striking off of any of them, whereas the monastic schools were, and always will be, rather rare, and it was considered that it might be safely done. It was not a part of the original constitution of the Board to exclude them.

24225. Do you consider that exclusion to be justified on its merits, or that it is the effect of the prejudice of the day?—I would rather myself not exclude them, but as I believe Archbishop Murray was a party to excluding them, I cannot consider it should be deemed a bad rule I would not exclude them myself. I have to add, that it was thought that the ladies of the convents are much more amenable to law and to regulations than monks are, who may wonder about in any manner without any inconvenience, whereas the ladies always remain pretty much in the same place, and may be relied upon to obey our rules.

24226. Were you a member of the Board when the regulation was made that no monastery or convent should have more than one school attached to it?—I was.

24227. And what was the reason for that limitation?—Well it was thought that otherwise they might destroy all the schools in their neighbourhood by having a number of affiliated schools all round them called convent schools, and the strong measures that were sometimes taken to prevent children from going to other schools made the Board at the time feel it necessary to put that limitation on, to have only as many convent schools as there are convents.

24228. Was that limitation adopted unanimously by the Board?—I do not remember any disagreement to it.

24229. Do you consider that is a limitation which ought to be maintained permanently?—I see no harm in the limitation. I am rather against every limitation myself. I would rather leave it to the people to say what schools they would go to, but I would not propose myself an alteration of that rule; but if the Roman Catholics felt any displeasure against the rule I would not oppose their recommending it, and they are strong enough in the Board to do so.

24230. The Earl of Devonport.—Is the paper you were so kind as to send to us, you state that "the appointment of a second paid Commissioner, so that one should be a Roman Catholic and one a Protestant, would combine all the advantages expected from a small paid Board with those which are secured by its present constitution." Do you make that remark with reference to the amount of routine business that there is which makes it desirable to have a second paid Commissioner, or is it with reference to the feelings of the country?—It is partly with reference to the feelings of the country, and whatever class is only a person of one religion, persons of an opposite religion will not like very often to confer with him confidentially, and also it would certainly give some relief to the existing Commissioner who, I think, has more work than his successor would like to take.

24231. I suppose in fact the routine business at present is much larger and greater than it was some years ago?—A great deal. A great deal of the routine business is necessarily done by the two Secretaries and the two Chiefs of Inspection.

24232. Is the present general attendance of the Board such as to represent fairly the interests of the different religions of which the Board is composed?—Indeed I believe it is.

24233. There is no particular preponderance of one over the other?—I do not think there is any preponderance that is felt.

24234. So that in fact the large number of the present Board is no disadvantage in that respect?—No;

Feb. 16, 1889.  
 Right Hon.  
 Members  
 Longford

we have the advantages of a small Board in practice, because the Board is a small Board as it meets.

24225. But is it not a fact that out of the number that generally attend the majority of that number are constant attendants?—Yes.

24226. So that practically there are at least half a dozen members who are constantly in the habit of attending?—Yes, they do more of the business in that way than the rest, but none of them would go on with an important measure in the absence of the others. I have known, for instance, when there would be no Roman Catholic at all present, and a matter brought forward in which their feelings or interests might be concerned, we have said at once, "We had better put off this till we have an attendance of Roman Catholic members," and the same would be done with regard to Presbyterian or Church of England members.

24227. Then, as regards the practical working of the present system of education, I suppose we may say that there are half a dozen members of the Board who are thoroughly conversant with it?—Yes, I think there is that number.

24228. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In your paper you have stated what you regard as "the peculiar fundamental principle of the National system." What is it, may I ask, in your opinion?—That there should be no interference with the religious opinions of any of the people.

24229. Do you approve of that fundamental principle?—Yes.

24230. And desire its continuance?—And desire its continuance.

24231. Do you co-Commissioners, as a body, desire the continuance, do you think, of that principle?—I believe the majority of them do.

24232. Is there a minority, you think, who would prefer denominationalism though administering a united system?—I am not able to speak for any of them, but I believe there are some who would prefer a separate school for children of their own faith.

24233. Now, what would be the result of a different system as Ireland in your opinion?—That the minority would do without education, and that the majority would get a very good education as at present.

24234. That in some cases, I presume, the faith of that minority would be endangered, or the children obliged to resort to an inferior school?—One or the other, I think, would take place.

24235. Do you find catechism more difficult to deal with in reference to religious rules of the Board than any other class?—I mean ministers of the different denominations?—Yes.

24236. What is their natural disposition in this matter?—Their natural disposition is to consider very much, I think, the prohibitions of their own creed and their own class as the thing to be most attended to.

24237. You seem to think that the Commissioners of National Education are well acquainted with the affairs of the Dispensation which they administered. Do you adhere to that opinion, or is that your opinion with regard to the Commissioners?—I think a great many of them are. There is every shade of opinion on the Board. There are some Commissioners who do not often attend, and they require a good deal of information to be given them on the spot of the moment.

24238. From whom do they obtain that information?—From the secretaries or the other Commissioners present.

24239. Which Commissioner do you regard as best acquainted with the rules and the administration of the system?—Our resident Commissioner beyond measure.

24240. And on whom are, in fact, all the Commissioners, more or less, dependent for information as to the administration of the system?—I do not feel myself dependent upon anyone. I have the rules, I have the reports, and I do not think I could be easily misled. I might forget particular rules or facts, but I do not think I am dependent upon anyone.

24241. Now, in your paper you say, "every im-

portant matter, and every case not already settled by precedent is brought before the Board?"—Yes.

24242. After nearly forty years of its existence, what important matters have you in view in such a statement?—Any moment a question might arise, and does arise, which parties think is different from anything that has taken place before.

24243. Any, you consider?—Yes.

24244. So that there is nothing by precedent or analogy to settle the question?—Often that is the case.

24245. Can you mention any such case?—Well, on the last occasion, seven gentlemen wished to have religious education given twice a day, and in the middle of the day, and it was found, I believe, after, I believe, more than thirty years or so, we had no rules to meet that case exactly, and yet we thought that it would be quite subversive of the discipline of the school to permit it.

24246. Now, you have referred also to every case not already settled, and you say that "no officer can be appointed or dismissed, promoted or degraded, rewarded or punished, except by a vote of the Board?"—Yes.

24247. "And all the officers are required to consult the Board before their final action in any matter of novelty and importance?" Does the Board itself frequently alter its decisions?—Yes, sometimes; not frequently, but sometimes it does.

24248. And does the Board retain in its own hands the power of firing teachers or officers?—Yes.

24249. In many cases have those first been committed—in the case of teachers, clerks, inspectors and others?—I should think they are sometimes.

24250. Has it happened that officers dismissed have been reinstated and restored, either to their former or to some other branch of the service?—That has happened, not very often. I remember it happening to a sub-inspector, or an inspector, who was dismissed, and afterwards made schoolmaster.

24251. What was his name?—I may be mistaken in the name, and should not like to put it in a like book.

24252. Can you furnish to this Commission, through you, the minutes of the decision of the Board in 1869, in reference to Mr. McAnley, once an inspector of National schools?—I can get them furnished to the Commission, but not, however, through me. I will apply, and get them for you. There were two persons, I think, of the name, one an inspector and one a professor, and I do not know which you have in view.

24253. The inspector. The professor was McAnley, but it is McAnley I refer to?—Very well.

24254. You will be kind enough to have it put into form, and have it put into connexion with you enclosed?—I will have it sent to the Commission as a separate document. I have no objection whatever to its being furnished to the Commission; and I do not wish to lend it in as something that I know.

24255. Well, in the first place this officer was dismissed the service?—Yes.

24256. As it was supposed, on very good grounds?—Yes.

24257. Through whom was it that his case was reconsidered by the Board—through whose influence?—I do not mean through what Commissioner's influence, but through what external influence was it done?—I do not think there was any external influence.

24258. Was not a memorial presented, requesting the Board to reinstate this officer?—I believe there was.

24259. From whom did that memorial come?—I am not able to tell the names to it. I will get the memorial.

24260. Can you tell any of the names?—I do not think I could tell any single name to it.

24261. Do you recollect whether Archbishop McHale's was one of the names?—I do not. I am inclined to think he was not; but if accurate knowledge is wanted I will get it with perfect certainty.

24262. The Chairman.—Is it an unusual circumstance for a memorial to be presented to the Board in

Feb. 16, 1893.

Right Hon.  
Mountfort  
Longfield.

favor of any body who has been dismissed?—I believe it is the inevitable practice. I do not remember even a case of a dismissal in which there was not a respectable memorial got up requesting us to retract the case.

24253. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is the memorial will you furnish this Commission with the minutes of the session of the Board and the memorial to which you have referred?—Certainly.

24254. You do not approve of what you call in your paper "the rival system," that is, a small paid body of Commissioners of Education?—No, I do not.

24255. You say that, "under the present system, all the business is, in fact, transacted by responsible men well acquainted with the most minute details," and so on. Who are they?—They are, the Resident Commissioner, the two Secretaries, the two Chiefs of Inspection.

24256. Now, leaving out the Resident Commissioners, whom you have named, do the public or the Government know those Secretaries and Chiefs of Inspection as responsible men?—No, I do not think they do. They consider me responsible, and we will take care that they shall not lead us into any snare. They are responsible to us, and we are responsible to the public.

24257. But, to a considerable extent, should you not regard the Commissioners as in the hands of their own officers?—Less, I believe, than in most Boards.

24258. You say that "those men practically do the chief work" and that "it is of little consequence whether they are called 'officers' or 'Commissioners'?"—Yes.

24259. Do you adhere to that statement?—Yes.

24260. Are the officers of the courts of law the responsible men?—No; they are responsible for their own business, but not, of course, responsible for what is done outside their own offices.

24261. But are not the judges the parties held by the Government and the country as responsible for the proper administration of the law?—They are responsible for the cases that they try themselves, but they feel a very quiet mind about any mistakes that are made in the offices.

24262. You also say that "there is over these offices a body of men called the Commissioners, who, to a considerable extent, represent the interests and feelings of the general community?"—Yes.

24263. What is the benefit of having a body to represent those interests and feelings?—Because the acts of the Commissioners are likely to affect the interests and the feelings of the community, and it is, therefore, important that the Commissioners should know what those interests and feelings are.

24264. But are not the interests and feelings of the community greatly divided with regard to the acts of the Commissioners?—They are very much, and therefore, it is desirable that every case should have a representation.

24265. And do you think it either a necessity or a desirable thing to have a large body to represent divided feelings?—I do.

24266. Are not the fundamental principles of the system both few in number and easily understood?—They are few in number, and, in most cases easily understood; but a number of cases occur on the line which cause a good deal of difference of opinion.

24267. The Chairman.—Are they always easily applied?—Not always easily applied. I think a fair man could find no difficulty in complying with them, but if a man takes the rules to spell out how much he can do above to the spirit without violating the letter, it is not always very easy to say what is to be done.

24268. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Part of your statement is, "When any important step is to be taken, its effect on the interests and feelings of every class is felt, and represented at the Board." To what important step do you refer, for instance, and how does that apply? I could mention several. We had, for instance, discussions about how far the practice of making the sign of the cross in schools at stated hours could be continued or not. It evidently would

be very prejudicial to the minority of Protestants to have them marked out five or six times a day in presence of their school-fellows as omitting a religious observance. Now, though I think that that practice ought to be discontinued, and voted for its discontinuance, I would not do so if the discontinuance was felt as a grievance by a great number of my fellow-countrymen, and therefore it was very important that our opinion should be fortified by a very large body of the same religion in our Board who supported us in carrying out the rule.

24269. Since the increase in the number of Commissioners, has not the board-spirit itself been the same several times of divided feelings?—Certainly.

24270. And numerous protests?—Certainly.

24271. You say that, "In a large Board, composed of unconnected members, there is no danger of a system of mutual concession," and so on; and "It is difficult to prevent a latent understanding of this kind from growing up among a very small body of men, where the common employment which brings them together engenders a considerable portion of their time." Now, should you apply that as a general principle?—I think that the spirit of the former is very apt to prevail amongst a small body of men who are supported by the system which they are administering.

24272. Should you apply that to the Poor Law Commissioners?—There is danger of it there.

24273. Are they not a small Board?—Yes.

24274. Are they not distinguished at once by fairness, impartiality, uniformity of interpretation of their rules, and firmness in their administration?—They are a very respectable body. I have a very high opinion of them, and I knew them on one occasion to be obliged to rescind a vote that they gave, in consequence of a particular feeling not being represented at the Board. They dismissed a chaplain for what they considered to be misconduct, and they were obliged to reinstate him. That could not happen in our Board.

24275. Have you not rescinded decisions to which you have come?—Oh, yes; but not in obedi-  
ence to a popular cry. If such a case came before our Board the chaplain would have been as well represented that we should have considered it was a case in which it would have been most proper, on the whole, to let it pass.

24276. Sir Robert Knox.—Could you meddle with a chaplain?—We would meddle with a chaplain; but we should do so after very full consideration, and letting the gentleness of his own permission consider his case most fully.

24277. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—How many chaplains have you?—We have none. We have two chaplains that we do not pay, but we have what is equivalent to chaplains in the same spirit. A great number of clergymen of different religious persuasions are patrons of schools.

24278. You say that, "The Resident Commissioner forms a connecting link between the offices of the institution and the Board of Commissioners." Whence the necessity of this connecting link?—Could not such a link be equally established if there was a small Board of paid Commissioners?—Of course. The largeness of the Board, and their being unpaid, makes it desirable to have this connecting link.

24279. You say, "He sits on every committee, and attends every meeting of the Board." Who compose the committee?—They are committees selected on particular occasions.

24280. From what body?—From the Board at large.

24281. What are your committees?—Well, I have been on book committees, on committees for revising the rules, and on agricultural committees. Those are the chief committees, and the only committees, I may say, on which I have been.

24282. I think you have given us to understand that the committees consist, for the most part, of the Resident Commissioner and the officers?—The ordinary routine committees consist of the Resident Com-

Feb. 16, 1878.

Right Hon.  
Mountfort  
Longfield

ministers and the officers; but there are special committees men when there is any special object to inquire into.

24293. You also say, that "through him all the chief officers learn the feelings and opinions of the Board," should not their acquaintance be with the rules and practical details of the system, rather than with the feelings and opinions of the Board?—They are acquainted with the rules and practical details without the interference of the Commissioners. They learn them by custom and by reading the rules; but other matters they know only by their being pointed out to them by the Commissioners. I do not know that I have made myself understood.

24294. Are not the rules fixed?—They are.

24295. Of course subject to alteration?—Yes.

24296. But are not the feelings and opinions of the Board a varying quantity?—I do not think the feelings and the opinions of the Board very much, but different questions arise which bring in new feelings and opinions.

24297. Should you not regard it as quite enough for the officers to be made acquainted with the decisions of the Board?—No, because cases may arise in which the officers may not know that there has been a decision exactly bearing on the subject, and be confused with the Resident Commissioners, who tell him that the question ought to be so and so.

24298. But the Commissioners surely do not leave it to any one of their body to communicate simply orally their finding—do they not give a finding in writing?—Wherever there is a decision made, the officers can know that.

24299. In fact, under a divided Board, with divided feelings and interests, may not the officers be often placed in difficulties?—The officer is in no difficulty if he acts according to the best of his judgment—that is, a reasonable judgment.

24300. That is, if he acts according to the rules?—Of course; according to the clear rules, or according to a doubtful interpretation if he acted according to the best of a reasonable judgment.

24301. But if he seeks to act in accordance with the feelings and opinions of a Board who are divided, do you not conceive that he is placed in a difficulty?—If he violates the rules he is.

24302. You also say that "the Board can never fall into any mistake from ignorance of its rules, or of the facts to which they are to be applied." Has the Board never fallen into a mistake from ignorance of its rules?—I do not remember any occasion on which it has done so.

24303. Do you know the late rule passed in 1866?—I do not know it by the name of the year of 1866.

24304. In reference to religious instruction?—Yes, I do.

24305. You are acquainted with that rule?—Yes.

24306. And the nature and extent and bearing of it?—Yes.

24307. To what officer do the Commissioners specially look for its interpretation?—We do not look to anyone for its interpretation. If the rule is violated, the violation comes before us, and we interpret it.

24308. Have you ever yet given a decided interpretation of your own rule of 1866?—Of course not, because our object is to give a rule which does not require interpretation. If we gave an interpretation, that interpretation should be the rule.

24309. Have not managers of schools and others from all parts of the country requested the Board to give them an interpretation of their own rule that they might know how to conform to it?—Whenever a question is asked of us, *bona fide*, we answer it, but we do object to persons, as it were, cross-examining us on questions not likely to occur, in order to get our opinion on all possible cases. We think when the case occurs it is time enough for us to answer it. If we thought there was any reasonable doubt we would answer, but we rather would it is kind of correspondence.

24310. Has there never been a reasonable doubt expressed to the Commissioners with regard to the

interpretation of that rule?—I do not remember such a case. There may have been such a case, and if there was, we should discuss it, and an answer would be given.

24311. Did not Lord Austin make an appeal to the Commissioners to know how he should act with regard to that rule, whether it compelled him to forcibly expel a child?—I do not remember the question. It may have been asked when I was in the country.

24312. Then are you aware that he did not obtain a specific answer from the Commissioners as to how to interpret or apply that rule?—I am not aware of anything about it. If it ever took place it was while I was absent. I was absent a good deal of the year 1868, at the Commission in London, and whatever took place then, I was not aware of.

24313. May I ask again, to what officer, under the circumstances, would the Commissioners specially look for a fair and proper interpretation of that rule?—To no officer. They would interpret it themselves.

24314. And why have they not done so—why have they not given a specific answer?—I do not remember the facts at all.

24315. Are the chief officers themselves acquainted with the rule, and do they agree as to its interpretation?—I never heard a difference of opinion amongst them; but if they disagreed we should then feel it necessary to give an answer to our officers.

24316. But have the officers themselves not frequently appealed to you for a uniform interpretation? I do not know that they have frequently done so. But it has sometimes happened that an officer has asked us what has been done in particular circumstances, and we always answer him.

24317. Have not that rule, and the interpretation, and the application of it, given rise to more correspondence than anything else since the passing of the rule in 1866?—I believe it has given rise to a good deal of correspondence. I am not able to compare the amount with the correspondence on other subjects.

24318. Can you, as a Commissioner of Education, give an interpretation of that rule?—I think I can.

24319. The words of the rule are these:—No pupil, who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Protestant, is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction, in case the teacher giving such instruction is a Roman Catholic, and no pupil, who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Roman Catholic, is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction, in case the teacher giving such instruction is not a Roman Catholic. And further, no pupil is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of any religious instruction to which its parents or guardians object. Provided, however, that in case any parent or guardian shall express his desire that his child shall receive any particular religious instruction, and shall record such desire in a book to be provided in the school, when necessary for that purpose, this prohibition shall not apply to the time during which such religious instruction only is given. The entry in the book shall be signed with the name or initials of the parent or guardian, and the book shall be submitted to the inspector, so often as he visits the school." Supposing a Roman Catholic child should come to a school, the patron of which is a Protestant, and the teacher a Protestant, and must on remonstrance for the religious instruction, the Authorized Version of the Scriptures being used, does your rule bind the teacher to expel that child by force?—I think it does.

24320. Supposing that there is a Protestant of one religious denomination, as the teacher, giving religious and Bible catechetical instruction, does your rule bind him to expel, or put out by force a child of another Protestant denomination?—I think it does not.

24321. Is that the interpretation of your rule, do you think, which would be given by the Commissioners?—I think it is.

24322. Then, for instance, should you approve of this as a record by one of your officers:—"The teacher, John Haney, who is a member of the Established Church, gives catechetical religious instruction

to the pupils of the Presbyterian Church, without having obtained the written authority for so doing from the parents of such pupils. This practice is contrary to the rule of the Board, and the Inspector is requested to see that teachers observe the rule in future." Is that a correct interpretation of your rule as signed by one of your officers?—I do not know whether it is signed by one of our officers, but I should consider that not a correct interpretation of the rule, because my opinion is that it was intended merely to make as between Protestants and Roman Catholics, and not as between Protestants of different denominations. I never heard that any jealousy existed between different denominations of Protestants. They had no objection to the instruction being fairly given.

24323. Are you not aware that many Protestants think that the differences between them and the Unitarians, for instance, as to religious dogma or faith, are as great as between Protestants and Roman Catholics?—They do.

24324. Would your rule authorize a teacher, a member of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, to give religious instruction in the Bible and Catechism of the Church, approved of by the Church, and sanctioned by the Church, to a Unitarian child?—I think the rule would sanction it, if the child did not stay away, or the parent keep him away. A Unitarian parent would have little objection to it. They are not at all suspicious as a body.

24325. Then you adhere to your opinion that the word, which I have just now read, is not a proper interpretation of your rule?—Yes, I disagree with it.

24326. Then the record which I have read is signed by P. F. Keenan, Chief of Inspection. Your interpretation differs from his interpretation of the rule?—It does.

24327. Then I presume you agree in the interpretation given by Mr. Bole, District Inspector.—"The entry made by Mr. Keenan on last page appears to have been made under a misapprehension, as the Board's rule does not require certificate of parent where the catechetical instruction is in accordance with the faith of a child of one Protestant denomination, the teacher being of a different Protestant denomination."—William Bole, District Inspector. 9th September, 1891. You agree in that interpretation?—Yes. That is, I think, what I have stated.

24328. Then follows this certificate:—"I certify that the above are correct extracts from the 'District Inspector's Observation Book of Tonduff National school.'—James Boyle, Presbyterian Minister, Manager of Tonduff National school. 9th February, 1892."—I see no reason to doubt it. I did not intend to express a doubt about it when I said I did not know whether it was signed by one of our officers or not, but surely that I did not know anything about it. I agree with the second and not with the first.

24329. Now, with an officer of such experience as Mr. Keenan giving such an interpretation of your rule, it is to be wondered at that any manager or teacher should have difficulty in interpreting that rule of 1866?—Certainly it shows that we did not frame the rule as well as we perhaps might have done.

24330. You say that "the appointment of a second paid Commissioner, so that one should be a Roman Catholic and one a Protestant, would combine all the advantages expected from a small paid Board with those which are secured by its present constitution." Has not the one paid Commissioner so discharged his duties, that already are enjoyed all the advantages expected from a small paid Board with those that are secured by its present constitution?—I think so. There has been no discontent felt, but I think he is overworked.

24331. Has he not given full satisfaction to the Roman Catholics?—I think he has.

24332. And often at the risk of not satisfying the Protestants?—Yes.

24333. Now, if one-half of the Board is Roman Catholic, and that that one-half is thoroughly united,

and that the Protestants of the different denominations upon the Board are divided, and belonging to different sections of the community, why should the second paid Commissioner be a Roman Catholic when one-half of the Commissioners are already Roman Catholics?—He would count as one of the ten Commissioners. Mr. Macdonnell counts as one of the ten Protestants. The Roman Catholic paid Commissioner would count as one of the ten Roman Catholics, so that it would not alter the relative power in the Board. It would merely give what I think I have already mentioned to the Chairman, a power of conferring with persons of his own religious persuasion, which might be deemed of some value.

24334. Substantially has not the officer indicated already the power and privilege of conferring with those of his own denomination in addition to the fact that Mr. Macdonnell has given full satisfaction to the Roman Catholics?—He has.

24335. Mr. Gilmore.—Do you think that the appointment of a double secretariat, one of the secretaries being a Catholic and the other a Protestant, is likely to conduce to the unimpaired working of the system, in which all parties should feel equal confidence in the person at the head of affairs?—Do you not think that our secret very being an honest man, and anxious to discharge his duty fairly and conscientiously, would be self-sufficient and likely to carry out the intention of the Commissioners as a double secretariat, one secretary being a Roman Catholic and the other a Protestant?—I think that one would do the business as well, but in order to get the confidence of the public, and to be in intimate correspondence with them, it is desirable that there should be two.

24336. Do you not think that it is a very desirable thing in this country that Catholics should feel confidence in Protestants and Protestants in Catholics, and that Protestants and Catholics should not look on each other as men watching each other, and each anxious to steal a march on the other?—I think it is desirable that that should exist, but it does not exist.

24337. Is it wonderful that it should not exist when in a great public Board it is assumed that Catholics cannot be trusted and Protestants cannot be trusted, but that each must watch his neighbour?—No, I think they are more likely to have confidence in men of any opposite creed when they are not compelled to have that confidence in them when they are told "you shall have a secretary of your own religion if you wish to confer with him."

24338. That being the case then how far would you carry that principle because there are differences of religion amongst some classes of Protestants? The Unitarian and the Trinitarian Protestants feel just-nessed sectarian differences arise; and where would the end of it be?—It is all a matter of degree—just as far as it is necessary in order to secure the easy working of the system. I hope the day will come when it will not be necessary.

24339. Do you think that the double secretariat is likely to bring about that, so far as you can form an opinion?—Not at any time, I am afraid, but I think things are tending to that.

24340. Master Brooke.—Has the Lord Lieutenant ever practically interfered with the rules that have been laid before him?—He has never been consulted except on one occasion, and I think he showed that he took a great interest in the rule on that occasion.

24341. Do you mean in 1810?—No, there was no necessity for consulting him then, but in 1866, in reference to the rule that I have been alluding to.

24342. That is the only instance you remember of interference on the part of the Lord Lieutenant?—I believe that is the only instance that took place.

24343. Was not that rule of 1866 suggested by Mr. Fortescue; did not the suggestion actually come from the Government?—I believe it was, but that, of course, would not exempt us from the necessity of submitting the rule in its exact terms to the Lord Lieutenant; and I believe the correspondence led to some changes in the rule until it was finally fixed upon.

Feb. 16, 1863.

Right Hon.  
Wm. St. John  
Longfield.

24344 The Lord Bishop of Meath—You said that you would not regard merely material advantage in referring these questions to the Lord Lieutenant in Council as occupied with referring it to the Lord Lieutenant personally?—No.

24345 Would you be kind enough to say why you think not?—Because I do not see any advantage. The Council is, in fact, a larger body than the Board, most of the members knowing nothing about the rules and not likely to give any attention to them.

24346 You are aware, I dare say, that important questions are referred beforehand to a Committee of the Privy Council in order to report to the Council itself. Would not that be desirable in a case of this kind?—I think it is better on the whole that the Lord Lieutenant should choose what advisers he may take. When he is called upon to act it is on his responsibility as representing the nation at large.

24347 May I ask your opinion upon a scheme that has been laid before this Commission? A scheme of this kind has been suggested that the State should concern itself merely with the secular education of the children in the primary schools, leaving it to the patron of each school to give religious instruction just as he pleased, at all times and in all ways that he desired, the State taking care, by means of its Inspectors, that the secular education should reach the standard that it considered necessary. What is your opinion of that as compared with the existing system?—That it is not suited to the state of Ireland, because it would not make any provision for the minority. Where there was a large body of persons of one religious persuasion, the minority would have no choice, except to go to no school, or to a very inefficient school, or to be subject to the religious teaching of the clergy of a different persuasion.

24348 Supposing the case of these small minorities was provided for by voluntary associations, would that objection hold?—It would prevent it from being quite so unobscure, but it would not prevent it from being urged, that a school should be supported by the State, which the minority would not be permitted to attend—voluntarily not permitted, because they could only attend on a condition which was wrong. I do not think that a person receiving money from the State for the support of a school has a right to put a condition on any child, which would make it improper for that child to attend the school.

24349 You are aware that the two largest religious communities in this country seem to advocate a plan of that kind, that they agree so far?—I am not aware of that. The clergy on both sides naturally like it, it is certainly more convenient to them to be free from all restrictions.

24350 Then you do not think that that scheme meets the views of a large portion of the laity on both sides?—I think not. I think that the laity on both sides are satisfied with the present system.

24351 Lord Clarendon—You have stated that the Inspectors under your Board were Protestants and Roman Catholics?—Yes.

24352 And that vacancies are filled up from each persuasion as they occur?—I think so.

24353 Now, in the districts to which those Inspectors are appointed, is there any reference made to the religious belief of the majority of that district in sending a Protestant or a Roman Catholic Inspector, or do you send Protestant and Catholic Inspectors indiscriminately?—Nowly indiscriminately.

24354 You were asked to what body the changes in the rules were deplorable, and you mentioned that they were displeasing to the Presbyterian body especially?—That was the body that chiefly objected to the rules, I do not remember many protests.

24355 But were there not other changes made at an earlier time which were the means of reconciling that body to the system which it now adopts?—There were some changes made before I was a member of the Board, which I believe reconciled them to some extent to the system.

24356 But at the present time we might say that

the Presbyterians, as a body, more approve of the Board than perhaps any other denomination?—Yes; I think they give more cordial support to the Board. I may add that when we made the rule originally relating to religious instruction, there were protests against the rule by both sides. The Presbyterians, I believe, to a man, protested, and the Roman Catholics protested; but the Church of England who held the mean between them, tried to make the rule as accommodating as possible.

24357 Then the greatest objection to the system at the present moment are the Roman Catholics I suppose?—I think so.

24358 More than any other body in the State?—Yes; they seem to object to it more.

24359 Would you think it desirable that a change in the rules should be submitted to Parliament, say for a month, before it is carried into effect?—I am so used to it, and so great harm either.

24360 You prefer having these changes submitted to the Lord Lieutenant?—I think so, because I think anything submitted to the Lord Lieutenant needs a practical solution at once from a responsible person, whereas the matters submitted to Parliament, as far as I know, lie dead before them.

24361 But does it not occur to you that the Lord Lieutenant, and perhaps the Chief Secretary also, generally represents one particular party in the State, and that it would be more desirable to have such changes of rules submitted where all parties were represented, as in Parliament?—Yes, but the Lord Lieutenant generally represents the whole party as the majority of the House of Commons represents, so that I do not think that there would be much difference in the result.

24362 But the public said the Board would know that any change they were about to make would be subject to be challenged in Parliament by any party whatever?—But it is subject to be challenged in Parliament, and our conduct is challenged in Parliament very often.

24363 But that is after you have decided upon something?—Yes.

24364 But would there not be a difference, and would you not be safer if your contemplated changes were challenged before they were absolutely made?—Yes; but I think we are safe enough, and I am not afraid, but of course it would make us safer.

24365 Mr. Deane—Have the Roman Catholics lately ever expressed publicly their preference for the present system of education over such a one as that alluded to by his lordship the Bishop of Meath?—I am not aware that they have ever done so. I do not think that they have ever expressed a preference.

24366 I understood you to state your belief that they do not hold that opinion?—Yes.

24367 May I ask you on what grounds you found that belief?—I do not think they have taken any part against our schools except where it appeared necessary for political objects. I think that there are reasons why at present the Roman Catholics have would naturally not wish to take any step that appeared hostile to their clergy, and very properly so; but I think that their not taking any steps hostile to us is a very strange ground.

24368 Is it not a fact that the Roman Catholics of the class that I presume you allude to—I presume you allude to the better and more highly educated classes—is aware it a fact that they adopt the denominational system in the education of their own children, invariably?—So do Protestants. I think every man would prefer the denominational system for his child to a general one.

24369 And why not then for his neighbor's child?—Because I think, in the state of Ireland, it is impracticable. Systematically all the advantages of a denominational system are given at present, because—I will take the case of a parent who appoints his own teacher absolutely. We do not interfere with him at all provided he is a proper man. He may have all

Feb 26, 1899.

Right Hon.  
Norman  
Langfeldt

his Sunday for religious instruction, he may have one day in the week entirely and exclusively devoted to religious instruction; and he may have an hour in every other of the five days devoted to religious instruction, and that is as much as anyone would wish to have. Our rules only say that we shall not give it as to interfere with the secular instruction, and thereby deprive others of their rights.

24370. Would it not be desirable, if it were possible to do so, to make the system of State aided education entirely acceptable to the bishops and clergy of the various Churches in the country?—Yes, I think it would be, if they would accept it.

24371. Do you think it would be possible to carry on continuously any system of education in Ireland to which the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy objected very strongly on conscientious grounds?—If they objected on conscientious grounds, I do not think that it would be possible or desirable to carry it on.

24372. Have you known of any difficulties arising in regard to the agricultural schools on the removal of the teacher, in consequence of claims by him as a tenant against his landlord for compensation for improvements made during his tenancy?—I think we had one or two cases.

24373. What has been the action of the Board in regard to those cases?—Well, to treat him with as much liberality as we could do without robbing the public funds—to consider everything very liberally, and to take a very merciful view of the case.

24374. I am not speaking now of the cases where the teachers have been the tenants of the Board, but where they have been tenants of a landlord in the neighbourhood—either of the manager or of any landowner who has given the use of land for agricultural purposes for the school?—We could not interfere at all if he was the tenant of another man.

24375. Would it be desirable for the Board to make the acceptance of some principle which would guide future possible arbitration on these questions a preliminary to granting aid to an agricultural school?—Yes, I think it would; and whenever we find any litigation or trouble caused by our leaving a loophole for it, we try to stop that in all future contracts. We are made wiser by experience, but we never had any very serious trouble in that respect.

24376. Do you think that supposing these schools were extended in number, some such scheme as that which I have suggested would be beneficial in some measure in introducing into these particular districts where the schools might be a sounder feeling on the subject of dealings between landlords and tenants, in the way of showing that it is possible to be just to the one without being unjust to the other?—Yes, I think it would be desirable; but there would be a good deal of difficulty in it, because the landlord of course would not submit to our rules.

24377. Why do you suppose that he would not submit?—I do not think it likely that he would. I think that the landlord would make his losses and any "I will carry it out myself, and appoint my own arbitrators if I have a dispute."

24378. What I suggest is simply that there should be an arrangement, a written agreement, entered into that a certain amount of enjoyment, or a certain cash payment in case of non-enjoyment, or something of that kind should be entered on by both parties, landlord and tenant, leaving the Agricultural Inspector of the Board to act as arbitrator in case of a dispute. Do you think that any landlord who is letting land for the purpose of an agricultural school would be likely to object to an agreement like that?—I do not think that a dispute ever arises between a teacher and a landlord of a school. The teacher does not by out any money in permanent improvements. It is the duty of the Board to do that, if they think it is necessary to be done.

24379. The Chairman.—What business has the Board to encourage teachers to take model farms under other landlords than itself?—I am not aware that the teacher does take farms; but we take farms and give

them to the teachers. We take farms with the intention and the avowed intention of giving them to the teachers, but I am not aware of any instance in which a teacher is himself with our privity a tenant of any one else but ourselves.

24380. Lord Clonbrock.—Mr Deane was comparing a system under which a teacher has land with that of an ordinary tenant. Now, it strikes me that there is no analogy between the two cases, and for this reason—the teacher holds the land exactly, as on right to hold the land exactly, while he holds his teachership, and therefore might be called upon at any slight notice to give it up. Well, in such a case as that I think it would not be difficult to frame some agreement by which he should receive compensation for growing crops if he has to give up his land at any moment; and the question would be whether you Board could not frame some rule of compensation in that way, or is it to be left to the Agricultural Inspector to say what payment the teacher ought to receive?—That is what I understood in saying that we should treat him most liberally; but it is rather new to me—I did not know it before—that the teachers in any number hold farms under anyone but the Board. If so, we have not anything whatever to do with them.

24381. Mr. Sullivan.—Has the subject of the manuals for teaching geography belonging to the Board come recently before the Commissioners?—Yes; I have a proof of the first part of it now before me for correction—not for correction in the sense of correcting the press, but it was referred to Professor Jelfett and to myself to read over the book to see was it a suitable book—and the first part of it is now before me.

24382. What was the reason that the book was left in the condition it was in for so many years?—I believe there is no reason; it is like a thing undone when there is no reason for its being undone, but in the press of business they did not make improvements fast enough.

24383. I find from the returns of the Board that the sales of that book for ten years amount to £200, whilst the sale of a book belonging to one of the professors, who is recently dead, or rather two books that correspond to a great extent—two books on geography—of the Board, in the same ten years, amounted to £7,893 8s. 2d!—I think that is a reasonable proof that the public considered those books better than ours.

24384. It was not the public, but the Board?—The Board do not dictate what books they are to buy. The schoolmaster gets books according as he thinks the pupils want them.

24385. Is there any connection between the fact of this enormous number of books purchased by the Board of one of their professors and the deplorable state in which the books on geography were left for a series of years?—It may have been that they did not consider the book on geography a good book, and, therefore, bought the other in preference.

24386. Then, why is it that that book has been recommended to the teachers in training as the book from which they were to be examined?—The only account I can give is that it was considered the best when it came out, and that in the press of business we did not keep up to the standard of geographical knowledge, and we are now doing it.

24387. Then, in that case you admit that the Board, to a certain extent, allow books beside their own to be purchased in preference to their own?—We always do that. We do not require that our books shall be bought.

24388. Is it an open market then to the public?—Yes.

24389. Absolutely?—Yes; they would sanction any book on geography that is not an improper book. Unless we see something to object to in it the schoolmaster may teach from it.

24390. But are the printing and publishing public aware of that fact?—I believe they are.

24391. Then, in your opinion, with a book like

Feb. 16, 1902

Right Hon.  
Members  
Longford.

of one of the professors of the Board, of which the large number of 28,000 copies were purchased in ten years, that if the market were clearly open to the public, that large number of copies of that book would be bought?—I think one of the professors of our Board wrote some books that were very well adapted to the use of the schools at the time, and that they got into great circulation; and perhaps his connection with the Board may have had something to do with the great sale, in consequence of which we have rather hesitated against any book that a professor of the Board wished to write; and several instances, I may say, have come before the Board in which we have rejected a book and discouraged it in consequence of its being written by an Inspector or professor. We would rather that they would not write books.

24392. Then, is not that unjust to the professors and teachers?—No. What we consider is this, that an Inspector has nearly enough to do in his proper business, and that if a book is written by an Inspector it goes out with an unfair advantage over other books. It exposes him to the risk of being thought a little unfair in examining too much out of his own books, and discouraging answers that are correct in themselves but deviate a little from what he says; and in that manner we think that the business will be better conducted if our Inspectors do not write books. It is not unfair to the Inspector, because he takes the office with that condition.

24393. Who is it that prepares the programme for the teachers in training?—It is prepared, I fancy, by the Head Inspectors and the chiefs of inspection, but, of course, submitted to the Resident Commissioner.

24394. Then, they are the parties who are responsible for recommending the books to which I have drawn your attention, for I find in the returns of the Board those particular books recommended to the teachers, the word "recommended" being in a footnote in reference to them?—Yes, we never make an attempt, I think, in our programme; but when we feel very strongly that a book is bad, we then take steps to substitute a better book in its place.

24395. Then do you think that your statement that it is fully open to the public applies really to the case, where the Board recommends to the teacher that this is the book in which he is to be examined, will he be likely to go and purchase another one?—I think that the book recommended is a considerable advantage; but it is open to the public—to all, except the teachers, of course.

24396. But is the teacher to whom the book is recommended, and who is taught in it, and who has much to gain by using it in his schools, likely to go and take another book that has had no connexion with the Board?—I think he is far more likely to take the book recommended, and, of course, his object is to pass a good examination; and it ought to make us very anxious to recommend the best books.

24397. Then, practically, the author of those books has had, for a series of years, a practical monopoly of the school-book trade of Ireland?—No, I think that is going too far. He has had a great advantage in the sale of books to a particular class of pupils. He has had a great advantage in the sale to that class of pupils.

24398. Does not Mr. Thoms enjoy the same monopoly as regards the printing?—No; it is put up, I fancy, by contract, and whoever makes the best offer for the contract has, during the duration of the contract, a monopoly. If anyone chose to underbid Mr. Thoms we should be very glad of it, and it would be our duty to take his offer.

24399. Mr. Gibney—Are you aware that other publishers than those who have published, and do publish, our school-books?—Yes, there has been a correspondence on the subject, and we were obliged to permit others to publish our school-books. As soon as we buy the school-book and pay for it, it is open to the whole world to publish it.

24400. They undertaking to make it conformable to the standard?—Yes.

24401. Mr. Sullivan—When a new book, or a new edition of it, is resolved upon by the Board, is it sent to some printer to be set up in type?—Yes.

24402. Is that put up by competition, and offered by contract before it is set up?—If a person has published, as, for instance, in the present case, a geography, he puts it up, as he likes to put it up, at his own expense, and, of course, we do not interfere. Whether it is put up by contract or not that is his look-out.

24403. And who pays for the expense of setting it up in type?—He does.

24404. Then the bill which was exhibited here by the accountant of the Board of Education, amounting for the setting of a small book, to more than £250, which was paid by the Board—that was a mistake?—That must have been some book that we were offering ourselves.

24405. Then I suppose that applies to all the books that you are offering yourselves?—Yes.

24406. And is that case it is sent to the printer and set up?—Yes.

24407. Is that open to the public to present their estimates for?—Not open to the public in that particular case, but I think our plan is this, that we have contracts which are open to the public, extending over a particular space of time, and then each individual piece that we send out is sent to the printer that obtains the contract.

24408. And when a book is sent to the Commissioners in order that they may revise it, and the printer who has set it up is paid for setting it up, and for all the corrections, he has actually a monopoly in his hands?—He has a great advantage over anyone else, but anyone else may print it also.

24409. But is it likely that anyone else will compete with our usual expenses of setting it up as covered?—In point of fact, they do sometimes.

24410. This book is a long time in use?—It is known to be a good book.

24411. In the case that came before the Commission, the cost of setting it up exceeded the cost of producing many thousand copies of it?—Yes, but that is, I must say, an expense which never could fairly be thrown upon the public, because that expense is not only the expense of publishing the book, but it is the expense of assisting us to compete it.

24412. And then is not that an argument against the Board being publishers at all—they cannot be fair to the trade?—If we could get good suitable books for the use of the schools without publishing, I think it would be better; but I do not see anything unfair to the trade, because everybody that uses any trade, gives an advantage to trade to the particular person with whom he deals. If I am publishing a book myself, I go to a publisher and give him an absolute monopoly so far as regards that book.

24413. But is it the business of the State to do so?—No, and as far as possible we avoid it, but if we think it is best for us to write a book, I do not see how we can avoid it.

24414. Is not the result of the Board writing and publishing books at all that it stops the production of school books in Ireland?—I do not see why it should stop the production in Ireland more than in England, because the books are equally open in both countries.

24415. When the Board are the publishers of their own books, are not the teachers more likely to take the Board's books than others?—Yes, they are.

24416. And therefore no person would be likely to compete with the Board?—I do not say that they will, but I say that there are several educational concerns published in England and Scotland also, that are very good.

24417. I refer to Ireland. Is there any chance for any person outside the Board to turn his attention to the production of school books, and to do it successfully?—I think there is. I think if a person wrote a good school book, he would partly have an inducement to write that school book in the hope that the Board would take it up, because if we found it was a good school book, we should at once enter into negotiations



Feb. 16, 1853.

Right Hon.  
Members  
Present.

with him to furnish us with a great number of copies of it.

24418. Does that apply to reading lessons?—It would apply to everything that we thought fit.

24419. In fact, would you give up your present system of having one uniform book, if other books of a good quality were produced?—Yes, we should leave it open, which we do. But I do not think it necessary that the same reading lessons should be taught to every child.

24420. Do you think it is desirable that they should?—I do not see any good or any harm in it. They have merely the same things in them. One reading book would put out before dog, and another dog before cat. They are all substantially the same—every reading book for a child.

24421. You stated, I think, that one secretary would do the business of the two. Would not the secretaries answer better if there were no chiefs of inspection—is there any use for those officers at all?—I think there is. I think the secretaries, without the chiefs of inspection, were rather overworked, and unable to do the whole business. There are a great many reports every week by inspectors, and it is very desirable to have two very laborious gentlemen to read over those reports, to make proofs of the reports, and to call the attention of the Board to anything material in them.

24422. Might not the duties which they now perform be dispensed with by a better reorganisation of the whole system of the offices?—No, I think that the chiefs of inspection perform offices which must be performed by somebody, and which are numerous enough to employ one hardworking man at least.

24423. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—The Bishop of Meath put to you a proposal which has come before us. I will ask your attention to a modification of that proposal which has also come before us, that the demands made by the Roman Catholic Bishops for denominational education might be met by a concession of this kind that in large places, places where there is more than one school supported by the State under Roman Catholic management and under Protestant management, the restrictions in such cases might be removed, keeping all other schools which are maintained in localities which admit only of one school supported by the State, to the present strict system of the conscience clause—that given facilities might be allowed to them in giving instruction in the first class of schools, while the conditions of the Board are not waived in the second class. Do you see any objection to that system or is your objection to that as strong as to the other?—By no means, there would be some difficulty in working that system, but I think it would be free from the objection because the necessity would be found then to support the school. But in point of fact I regard the grievance of want of religious instruction as very slight, because as I have mentioned already there are two days in the week, Sunday and another day, and in addition to that at least every day of the other five days, on which religious instruction can be given; and that is a much religious instruction as any clergyman would wish.

24424. Would there be any great difficulty in working this system, which made this change in the regulations of the Board under your present management?—No; I think not; it could be worked, I should not be afraid of it.

24425. The Question.—How would you guard against even which might raise of a minority school being maintained by some zealous individual for a few years and then by his removal or death, leaving?—I would apply the modification which is suggested only to those cases in which the majority was numerous enough to have a school supported for it by the Board. In point of fact, nearly all the expenses of most of the schools are supported by the Board.

24426. Mr. Stokes.—Has there been any case of an inspection of the National Board when for several years, at all events, suspended, who is now again at work under your Board?—I think not. I should be very much surprised and disappointed if that took place.

24427. I think you expressed a very favourable opinion of schools taught by nuns?—Yes.

24428. Assuming them to teach schools unusually well, is it not a matter of public policy to encourage them to teach as many schools as possible?—I think we encourage them to have as many schools as they can teach judiciously.

24429. We have been told that the limitation of the nuns to one school under a particular rule of the Board was brought about by an objection taken by the late Archbishop Whately. Is that the case?—No, I have not sat at the Board with Archbishop Whately.

24430. Do you remember the history of that change in the rule?—I think it except in. I do not think it was ever either opposed or much discussed, but the peculiar nature of the teaching by the ladies in the convents themselves, and all that appeared to make it a proper regulation.

24431. Do you think that by teachers are not able to stand their ground against the competition of nuns, without protection?—I think they could if there was no superior influence at work. I think if the people were left perfectly free it would be the case.

24432. Were not monastic schools taken into consideration with the Board from its first institution?—Yes.

24433. Did not the Government acquiesce in that relation between the Board and the monastic schools?—Yes.

24434. Do you think that the exclusion of monastic schools from aid is calculated to excite a feeling in the breast of the people of something approaching to persecution, and to alienate them from your Board?—I do not know that it has had that effect. I certainly would not call not getting money from the State persecution.

24435. But if, of two persons, one received money and the other was refused money, would not the latter regard it as a serious grievance?—It is a disadvantage to him, but he will not submit to the terms.

24436. If the monastic schools were willing to take your rules, would you admit them to aid?—I do not know what the Board would do. I fancy that they are not very anxious to come under the Board. The only change made in my time was to enlarge their powers, as I mentioned before, which I was very glad to do.

24437. I think you stated that you did not consider it of the essence of your system to impose a particular set of reading books?—Yes.

24438. Is there any example in any one of the 6,000 schools under the Board where another set of books is employed?—I fancy that our own reading-books are so good and so cheap as to exclude other reading books.

24439. Do you think that there is no other reason for the exclusive employment of those books, but simply their superior merit?—Our giving them cheaply, of course, must count that very materially, but it is desirable that, if we are to have books in the schools, they should be bound to a certain extent.

24440. Do you agree with the opinion expressed by the Resident Commissioners that there is a religious tone which pervades all your reading-books?—I think there is.

24441. Do you think that that religious tone is likely to be acceptable to the majority of the people of Ireland?—I do. I think the people of Ireland are, on the whole, a religious people; and the greatest pains have been taken not to allow a single thing in that could offend anyone's susceptibility.

24442. Are you aware that the Roman Catholic bishops have, by solemn resolution, expressed a preference for purely secular books, excluding common religion as set out in the reading books?—I am not aware that they objected to any particular parts in it. Of course, it might destroy our books altogether if we were to have books written that would not show that they were written by a person who believed in the Supreme Being; and I think that in that case the objection would take another turn. In no case can

Fit 14, 1842  
Right II in  
Mountfort  
Langford

you please an adversary. All we can do is to give us just cause of displeasure.

24443. Are you acquainted with the reasons which induced the Government to appoint one paid Commissioner, and only one?—I am not aware; it was part of the original constitution, and it was thought very desirable to have some constant attendant, and accordingly, that there should be a Resident Commissioner, but of course the Resident Commissioner must be paid. Mr. Carfile was first.

24444. Do you remember that the report of the House of Commons, upon which the National system was based, recommended apparently that the whole Board should be salaried?—I do not remember that in the report. It may have been.

24445. The recommendation runs thus:—"The Board of Education should be appointed by the Government, receiving salaries, and holding their offices during pleasure, all persons being eligible without religious distinction." Do you think that the objection which might have arisen on making a second appointment, in the person of a Roman Catholic, laid anything to do with the limitation of the paid Commissioner to one?—No, I do not know all the circumstances of the matter, but I do not think that had anything to do with it.

24446. Does the paid Commissioner occupy in any sense a position inferior to the other Commissioners?—No, certainly not, and he is superior in rank to most of them. There are only three who are superior in rank to him.

24447. Why is his name always put last as a Commissioner?—I think it is from his own very great indisposition to take his natural place. Of course he puts himself where he likes; but in rank he is superior to all I think but two or three noblemen.

24448. Mr. Gales.—The resident Commissioner signs, I believe, as the organ of the Board, the minutes after being endorsed?—Yes.

24449. You have stated that the books were open to the whole world?—Yes.

24450. I presume that that was taken as an inference from the fact that our books are not compulsory?—And we had a conference on the uniformity of having books with some correlation, as was almost necessary for our books, and a particular printer having the printing and publishing of them. The Treasury took it in hand, and they directed them that the whole world should have the power of printing our books. Of course it was only so the nation, and not for ourselves, that there was any monopoly, and that was a matter for the Treasury to consider. We pay for the copyright, and it is, of course, with the money of the nation, and then the whole nation enjoys it, and not a particular board.

24451. The books in the use of the Board, must, of course, be in conformity with the general principles of the Board, as to secular education?—Yes.

24452. And in reference to that qualification, the choice of books is, of course, limited accordingly?—Yes.

24453. And every book which is taken and used by the Board, must comply with those conditions?—Yes.

24454. Lord Bishop of Meath.—I understood you to say in reply to Mr. Dunn, that if the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy conscientiously and strongly objected to the present system of National education, you did not think that it could be carried on?—I do not think it could.

24455. We have had before this Commission, very strong, and I have no doubt, most conscientious statements of objections to that effect. Am I to understand, therefore, that you consider that the present system cannot be maintained, assuming the fact of strong and conscientious objections?—I distinguish between an objection conscientiously obtained and a conscientious objection. One means an objection founded on conscience; the other means only an honest objection. Now, I think, that though they honestly object to the system, it is not against their conscience, so long as,

because the system was approved of and carried out by the late Archbishop Murray, who was a perfectly fair representative of the Roman Catholic Church, and that no bishop can say that his conscience, as a fact, is violated by supporting our schools. But it is quite a different thing to say "I conscientiously object to this book of arithmetic, I do not think it a good one," but that does not mean that my conscience is affected by it.

24456. That makes us the judges and the interpreters, then, of what they mean?—It makes us the judges of a conscientious objection?—Yes; we must either judge of that or be their slaves; because, otherwise, all that a man has to do, or a large body, is to say, "My conscience is against that; you must not do it."

24457. Then if "reasonable" were substituted for "conscientious," would it express your meaning—a reasonable and strong objection?—Yes; "conscientious" was what I was asked about, but that word would do as well.

24458. The Earl of Devonport.—Are the objections of one or two individuals to be taken as the objections of the whole body?—Certainly not.

24459. Are there not in many dioceses in Ireland National schools with Roman Catholic priests as managers, and with their expense sanction and good wishes?—Certainly. I consider Archbishop Murray's presence a perfect security against anything contrary to the real principles of the Church being introduced.

24460. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Do you consider also that Archbishop Whately's presence expressed the views of the Church of England?—I think it showed that there was nothing in it contrary to the Church of England or he would not have been a member.

24461. Did not the Church of England actually dissent from it, and carry on a separate system of schools ever since?—The Church of England did not. A great many members of the Church of England did.

24462. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—And do you not find them expressing in the views that he held?—A great many of them do so.

24463. Earl of Devonport.—In the case of the Church of England the great difficulty is, that they do not join the Board, and in the case of the Church of Rome that they do?—Yes; in greater numbers.

24464. Sir Robert Ross.—In answer to the Rev. Mr. Cowie, you mentioned your opinion that the system of having denominational schools in such places as allowed of there being two schools could be carried out as a substitute for the present system?—I think it could.

24465. In such denominational schools, would you contemplate that persons of a different religion from that in which the school was claimed should be permitted to attend the instruction of the school?—Certainly. My opinion is, that if such a school was established, the proper way would be to say, "We shall look to see that you get a good secular education and nothing else, except, of course, to prevent anything immoral."

24466. And would you not recognize the school as being avowedly and officially of one religion or the other?—No, I would recognize nothing in it except that it was a proper secular school, and the secular education is the only thing I would look to.

24467. Leaving to the manager of the school to do as he liked in regard to religious instruction—to give it or not to give it, and that at any time that he chose?—Yes, that is my impression of what would be the case, if I understood the question rightly.

24468. Would you contemplate the inspectors entirely ignoring the question of religious instruction in visiting the schools?—Certainly; that the inspector should merely examine the children, and find out how many hours in the week were devoted to secular instruction, and see that they made proper progress, and of course should look to the cleanliness and tidiness of the school, but not to look to religious matters at all.

24469. Do you think that such schools would be

entirely free from any proselytizing influences in this country under present circumstances!—I should hope so; because, if I understood the question, such schools would only be established where the population of the opposite religion was so large as to enable them to have a school for themselves.

24470. What number attending the school would you consider would entitle them to have a separate school?—I should say that it ought not to be permitted, unless the opposite party could muster a school of 80 or 100.

24471. Then practically it would be limited to the large towns?—I think to Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Belfast, and a few other towns.

24472. But is it your opinion that such a system would be impracticable as applied to the country generally—as regards schools in minor districts?—I think quite impracticable. I consider a small school a bad thing. A good education cannot be given to the poor in very small schools.

24473. The Chairman.—What number do you think there ought to be in the school to keep it on foot?—I should like the number to be not less than eighty. That would imply about forty-five of an average attendance.

24474. The Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is not the rule of the Board that thirty is the smallest number which they recognise as forming a school?—That was the rule, but we have modified it within the last three years, and we give a minor grant to a minor school.

24475. Sir Robert Keble.—Twice than thirty?—Yes; we pay not according to the size of the school, but according to the classification of the master, and then we permit more masters and assistants if it is a large school; and in case of a school falling below thirty, then we will pay a rate to the master, but not the salary which his classification would entitle him to.

24476. Then why would you object to a country locality to the formation of a denominational school containing a small number of pupils, say ten or fifteen, in order to provide for the educational wants of a minority in that district?—But it is in the denominational school that would be taken by the large body it is a large body that I am afraid of.

24477. Yes; say that at present you allow schools to exist in which the number of pupils falls below thirty?—Yes.

24478. And in some cases they may perhaps fall below twenty?—Yes.

24479. Now, if you allow such schools to exist at present, why would you not contemplate allowing them under a denominational system, for the purpose of supplying the educational wants of a small number of persons of a particular persuasion—why would you require a school of eighty or a hundred in a district where at present you would allow a school of twenty?—I did not make my answer clear. What I meant was that we should, if possible, have a school of eighty or one hundred for the minority. It was to protect the minority that I would allow the majority only to have a denominational school where there was a minority strong enough to keep up a good school for itself.

24480. Then, in order to allow that minority to have a school you calculate that there should be a majority, amounting to 80 or 100?—No, I am again unfortunate. The majority, of course, would be large enough; but what I consider is this, I would not allow the majority, the dominant party in any town or village, to turn the whole of its own school into a denominational school. I would see that enough of children were left to support another school, that other school being denominational or not, I do not care which.

24481. And in all places in the country, where there could not be a sufficiently large minority to justify the Board in giving them a school, would you require the school in that district to be open to all denominations?—Yes.

24482. Mr. Stokes.—What is the minimum attendance now required to draw a grant from your Board?—Thirty is the attendance required by our rules, but

we have, chiefly, I believe, to accommodate Church of England schools, permitted a small grant to be made to the smaller schools.

24483. Without any minimum limit at all?—Except to reduce the grant, unless they have enough. We hope and trust that those schools will die out, and that there will be none of them.

24484. Lord Chelmsford.—Am I to understand from the evidence you gave awhile ago, that in your opinion the present hostility of the Roman Catholic hierarchy is not sufficient ground to justify or entitle the State to make any fundamental alteration in the present system?—Except so far as I have approved of what was proposed by Mr. Fortescue's letter, which would give them every benefit, which they have not at present; I would give them nothing that would hurt anyone else.

24485. When I said fundamental change, that means changing the present system from mixed to denominational?—Yes, I think so.

24486. Earl of Devonshire.—What do you particularly allude to as Mr. Fortescue's letter?—Permitting them to have denominational training schools—that chiefly.

24487. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—The Roman Catholic bishops have largely availed themselves of the National system of education?—They oppose now our training schools.

24488. But I speak now of the system as a whole?—Yes.

24489. And they have a very large number of schools under the present system?—Yes.

24490. Earl of Devonshire.—I suppose you mean denominational residences, as attached to the training schools?—And training schools entirely under the control, if they choose, of Roman Catholic bishops, subject only to our inspection, and certain regulations.

24491. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—They have been recognising all along in connexion with the system, parental authority?—Yes.

24492. Is not parental right acknowledged by the law of the land?—Yes.

24493. Do you not then regard, under those circumstances, the legitimate sphere of the clergy to be that of advice and act of counsel?—That of advice.

24494. Does the law anywhere recognise the right of anyone to go between the parent and his child?—No; but it recognises the right of the parent to take any adviser or director he thinks proper.

24495. You regard the position of the bishops, I presume, in connexion with this matter, more that of expediency than of principle, seeing that they have been so long identified with the system?—Yes; I consider that it is a serious disadvantage to our schools, that we have not a sufficient number of trained teachers.

24496. Now, would not a denominational system in which there would be a school in a parish under Roman Catholic management, with a Roman Catholic teacher, which the Roman Catholic children should attend, and a school under a Protestant manager, and a Protestant teacher, where the Protestant children should attend—would not such a system interfere with the free exercise of parental authority, and deprive parents of the privilege of selecting the best school for their children?—No; it would not deprive parents of the privilege of selecting the best school, but it would hold out a great inducement to a parent sometimes to select the worst, but still his parental authority would not be interfered with.

24497. But even in selecting the best school he might endanger the faith of his children?—Yes, and that is the reason I am in favour of the present system; at the same time, with regard to training, I think it is of such advantage that we should have trained teachers, that we should have training schools supported by the State, though under the control of the bishops as a great measure.

24498. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Supposing denominational training schools were established, there would be, I think, no difficulty in inducing them to adopt a com-

Ed 15, 1868.

—  
Right Hon.  
Montagu  
Langfield.

Feb 16, 1909.

Right Hon.  
Members  
Longford

science class of this kind, that no child should under any pretence whatever receive religious instruction from a person of a different religious denomination from his own?—But if they did that, it is our school then.

24499. Then supposing the school composed completely of Roman Catholics, they could introduce as much devotion as they pleased if it was denominational, but at the same time, if any Protestant child came there, they would be obliged to exclude him from all religious instruction?—I think that that would not work for this reason, that the child who caused such a change in the school as that would in one way or other be hated out of the school, and I say the same thing of a Roman Catholic child in a Protestant school. I will like it now that there are no Protestant children in a Roman Catholic school where religious instruction is given three or four times a day, and scattered through the day. Two Protestant children come in, and the whole system is changed, I say they would not be allowed to remain in the school. I do not say how it would be done, but I know enough of the world to know it would be done.

24500. But would it not be such an exceptional case that it really is hardly worth considering?—But that

is the very point. They would not be sent to the school, and they would be deprived of the privileges of going there. On the contrary, now at the current schools there are several Protestant children attending, as being the best place where they can get a good education, and they have not had any interference with their religious convictions.

24501. Mr. Gibson.—If the secular teaching given was largely interlarded with dogmatic teaching, do you think that a conscience clause in such schools would be of any use whatever?—None whatever. I do not think that a conscience clause in such schools could work.

24502. Supposing that the secular instruction in such schools should be so largely mixed with dogma that a child could not receive it without its adherence to the faith of its parents being endangered, would there be any use of a conscience clause?—None, for principles opposite to those of its parents would be inculcated in its mind almost without its knowledge.

24503. Therefore, while nominally receiving only secular instruction, the child would be receiving religious instruction also?—Yes, I think there are only two systems possible, such as ours and such as Mr. Cowie's. You can have no others in Ireland.

W. H. NEWELL,  
Esq., M.P.

W. H. NEWELL, Esq., LL.D., further examined.

24504. The Chairman.—Have you now, as secretary, anything to do with the discipline and working of the model schools at Marlborough-street?—Nothing.

24505. Were you formerly connected with them?—Never.

24506. Had you formerly any supervision of the working of any of the district model schools?—Yes, I had of all in some degree. When I was district inspector of course those where I was stationed were directly under my control, and as head inspector they were also more or less under my control, and also when I was chief of inspection. Again, now, as secretary, I exercise a certain amount of control over them.

24507. In what district of country?—Everywhere through the whole country.

24508. Except Marlborough-street?—Except Marlborough-street, and if any irregularity was reported from Marlborough-street it would be my duty as secretary to look into it, and to lay it before the Board, but I could not exercise any control without the sanction of the Board.

24509. At the period when you were serving as district inspector and head inspector, was the idea of the model schools, which the Board was desiring to carry out, principally that of places for training teachers, or of superior ordinary schools for teaching ordinary pupils?—I think the Commissioners had the two objects in view from the first, and have still. They have pronounced them in their reports as preliminary training schools—that is, for pupil-teachers, and they are also examples of the first-class day schools.

24510. At the present day, to which idea would you attach the greater importance, that of training schools for masters, or of places for commencing instruction to ordinary pupils?—They are both of such vast importance that I could scarcely say which is the greater. I think they prove more effective as day schools lately than as training schools, but as training schools—preliminary training schools—they have produced the very best teachers in the country. These are afterwards trained at the central department, but without being trained there, look so well instructed are quite as capable of managing ordinary schools as men who had a training there, but had not the advantage of training in the model schools.

24511. What are the different classes of youths in the model training schools that you would look upon as incipient masters?—Look who had served in the office of paid monitor, or who, from their superior answering in the ordinary schools, have been selected for the office of

pupil-teachers in the model schools. They must go through the ordeal of an examination, and they are generally selected from their aptitude for teaching, and perhaps from personal appearance and answers of exterior, so that they have all the preliminary qualifications required for a teacher.

24512. Is a pupil-teacher of a higher grade than a monitor?—Yes.

24513. Must a pupil-teacher pass through the preliminary grade of monitor?—Not necessarily. If there was a vacancy for a pupil-teacher there might be candidates from any classes in the district, and the most eligible of those on examination, would be selected, whether he had served as paid monitor or not.

24514. Practically, have the paid monitors a great advantage in the examination?—I think they have a very great advantage.

24515. Practically, at present is the competition for pupil-teacherhips confined amongst the paid monitors?—No.

24516. When in a district model school there is a vacancy for a pupil-teacher, is the fact of that vacancy communicated to all the schools within the inspector's district?—No. The inspector generally knows where he can find an eligible candidate, and if he has two or three competent ones, he determines which is the most eligible, either from previous knowledge or by competition. Examinations are not frequent.

24517. Practically, have the children of a common school any chance of becoming pupil-teachers?—It is generally from the common schools that they are selected.

24518. I mean an ordinary National school—not ordinary pupils of a model school?—It is generally from the ordinary National schools, and not from the model schools that the pupil-teachers are selected.

24519. When once a pupil-teacher gets into a model school has he not a tendency to confine his desire for employment to model schools?—By no means. He comes there to receive instruction and information upon the best methods of teaching, and he is then desirous of being transferred as soon as he gets charge of a school.

24520. At what age is a person allowed to become a pupil-teacher?—About sixteen.

24521. How long does he continue as such?—For two years he may continue.

24522. Is he allowed, if he chooses, to come up to Marlborough-street?—As a rule, he is not allowed, until he has charge of a school. If he is an eligible

had he is brought up before getting charge of a school, but the rule is that he must have charge of a school before coming to Marlborough-street, which is the training school for National teachers, and a pupil-teacher is not necessarily a National teacher.

24533. Then a pupil-teacher who desires to improve himself must get a school, and then absent himself from it for training?—That is the position, for about six months' training.

24534. Do you consider the present system of training the monitors and pupil-teachers in the district schools effective?—I think it is very effective.

24535. Do you desire it should be materially altered, or that the length of time they may be trained should be increased?—I think the two years ample.

24536. Are you prepared to express your opinion as to whether the six months in Marlborough-street is sufficient?—I am one of those who always thought the six months quite sufficient for the teachers when they pass through the model schools.

24537. Do you consider it sufficient for those who have not passed through the model schools?—As a rule I do. If a teacher comes up fairly prepared, with a reasonable amount of literary information, and has a natural aptitude for the profession, I think he acquires a sufficient knowledge of the organisation of schools, and the best method of school-keeping, in six months, and after that, it would be rather a loss of time for him to remain.

24538. Do you not think it would be better for the teachers, as a body, if the time at Marlborough-street were twelve months?—I don't think it necessary, and, besides, such an arrangement would take a much longer period to train the teachers coming forward.

24539. Do you not think the improvement in the teachers would counterbalance the disimprovement in their remuneration?—I think not. My reason is this, that they do not come up here to acquire literary information—that is a secondary object. They are supposed to have acquired sufficient literary information before coming. It is to acquire the method of communicating that information and the art of school-keeping that they come, and any man who has an aptitude for his profession can fairly learn that in six months. I always presume that teachers come up sufficiently qualified.

24540. Is not the time for which the teachers go into your schools very trifling?—I think in the training department there is not a sufficient proportion of the time spent here devoted to practice in the schools.

24541. Does the time which a teacher spends in the practicing of the school amount to more than a week?—I am not sure, but it must be more than that.

24542. Isn't the time as limited as that?—They are teaching every day. They teach some classes every day, either in the large school, or in the others. The practicing schools, or schools which are supposed to represent the rural schools of Ireland, have an attendance varying from forty to sixty, eighty, and one hundred, and the object of the teachers being in these schools for a week is to see the method in which it is conducted—the time table, classification, and so on, and not to acquire a knowledge of teaching which is acquired in the large schools from drafts.

24543. How much time does a teacher spend in the small or large practicing schools?—I am not certain. I have not looked into that, but I would say it is not as much as it might be, because it would be better to spend some time from the professional lectures, which are not profitable to men who are not well prepared for them.

24544. Is not the teaching in the model schools in Marlborough-street altogether professional?—Too much as I think.

24545. Rev. Mr. Cress—As distinguished from orthodox. Is there any catechetical examination on the lecture?—There is a catechetical examination on the lecture.

24546. Always do you say?—I think not always. I am not often present. It is not necessary I should

be; but I inquired into it, and I think a great defect in the training is, that there is not more of what I would call special instruction, and as it were "grading," or preparing the teachers in the very elements of their business.

24547. The *Choruses*.—Is there any periodical inspection of the model schools in Marlborough-street, by any of your inspectors or head inspectors?—None.

24548. Is there anyone head of the model schools in Marlborough-street?—I have always regarded the two professors as the heads.

24549. Are the two professors selected on the same principle as the secretaries—that of representing opposite parties, or opposite religions?—Yes, I think so.

24550. Do you think that dual headship a good system for a large school?—I always thought it a bad system.

24551. Do you think it desirable to have a chief or principal of these schools, making the professors merely the conductors of their several departments, and making the principal responsible for the general organisation and discipline of the establishment?—That is, to have only one head.

24552. Yes, one head?—I do.

24553. How long have any of your model schools been connected with the Department of Science and Art?—I am not sure how long. Not many years.

24554. Can you state what offices there are in Marlborough-street who are receiving payment from the Department of Science and Art?—The head master, Mr. Joyce, has at present two classes, and the master of drawing, Mr. Smith, has classes.

24555. What remuneration do they receive?—According to the scale laid down in the rules of the department for those pupils who pass the examination.

24556. Is it payment by results?—Yes. There are three classes in the first grade—first, second, and third classes, payment being £1, £2, or £3 for the first year.

24557. Does that go into the pockets of the teachers?—Entirely, and so also do the fees that they receive.

24558. What communications took place between your Board and the Department of Science and Art before the regulations were established allowing your teachers to become connected with the Department?—There was no communication between the Board as a Board and the Department of Science and Art. At least I never heard of any.

24559. Did the Department of Science and Art invade your Board without notice, and deal with the teachers themselves?—They deal with a committee which is chosen by the teachers, quite irrespective of the Board of National Education.

24560. They have the Board of National Education as control or knowledge of what is doing in these classes?—They can have a perfect knowledge of what is doing in these classes through their professors and through myself, who am chairman of the Committee this year—the first year I have served, but there is no report made on the subject.

24561. What is the Committee of which you are chairman?—It is a Committee that is required by the conditions for placing a school in connexion with the Department of Science and Art. The Department requires the Committee to consist of at least five members, of whom they shall approve.

24562. Who compose the Committee?—There are myself, as chairman, the two professors, the assistant professor, and Mr. Young, principal of the infants' school. I had no consent to act with them as yet. I have had nothing to do but see that the communications go in proper form.

24563. When was the Committee first established?—I think this Committee was first established towards the end of November last.

24564. Then it is a scheme just set on foot?—So far as I am concerned it is. There was a different Committee last year. The Department always communicates with the Committee.

24565. Who was the chairman last year?—I don't know, as I had nothing to say to it.

Feb. 16, 1889

W. H. Stowell,  
Esq., F.R.S.

Feb. 16, 1869. 24556 In this organisation among the officers of the National Board going on without being brought under the notice of the National Board?—I think so. It has been going on for years. I know that the Resident Commissioner is aware that the Department of Science and Art has offices in connexion with the model schools throughout the country, with the central model school in Mulborough-street, and also in connexion with many ordinary schools. The total number of National schools last year in connexion was forty-one.

24557. Is not this rather an informal way of doing business?—It may be informal, but there is nothing in the principles or in the teaching in connexion with the Department that is not in consonance with the principles of the National Board.

24558. Do the Board get any returns showing what their teachers are receiving from any other department?—The Department of Science and Art sends to the Committee a printed paper, showing the results—the number of successful pupils from each school, and the amount, of course, that is payable for each.

24559. Does that enable the National Board to see at once what rank of their teachers gets from the other department?—It would enable them so to see.

24560. Did any formal communications come in the first instance from the Committee of Science and Art, to know whether the National Board was willing that their officers should undertake the duties, and serve the Science and Art Department?—There may, but I never heard of it. If so, it was before I became secretary. The schools were in connexion some years before I was appointed secretary.

24561. What is the connexion between the Science and Art Department and the district model schools?—The same as it is here. A committee is appointed with the approbation of the central department, and all the rules and regulations are quite the same in one school as in another.

24562. May we understand that your opinion would be against the discontinuance of the period of training in Mulborough-street, but in favour of the training establishment being put under a single head?—Yes, that is my opinion.

24563. Are there any other changes of importance with respect to the training schools in Mulborough-street that you would desire to suggest?—I think that the teachers should receive more personal instruction from teachers of an humble class than the professors, and less professional teaching—that they should have "masters of study," as they are called in France, to superintend these studies, to instruct, examine them, and oversee them.

24564. Does it often happen at the present day that teachers of ordinary National schools get appointments as principal or assistant teachers in district model schools?—Yes, very often. Whenever there is a vacancy they are selected from the most eligible teachers, either in the special class, or perhaps from the ordinary class, or from amongst the best schools in the district.

24565. Is there not rather a tendency to promote monitor or pupil-teachers out of the model schools themselves, and to make a sort of separate caste?—I think not at all. There are some head superintenders who set them from altogether against it, and desire to give only a society of the appointments to teachers of model schools. I think the remark applied a good deal to Belfast, where they have managed to keep the appointments among themselves. However, it is a large school, and there are very eligible persons in it; but I don't think the observation applies to any other schools. The appointments are not very numerous.

24566. Rev. Mr. Croke.—Are you aware that out-half, or more than one-half, the female teachers in model schools must have been appointed before being twenty-three years of age?—I am not understood that.

24567. They could not have had experience in other schools?—I meant that they had been educated at other schools, and trained afterwards, because we have few teachers in charge of model schools, or assistants in model schools who have not been trained

24568. As I understand the Chairman's question to be, it is whether the appointments were given to deserving teachers who have earned their spurs in other schools?—I think they are.

24569. According to your returns, it appears that the greater part of the female teachers who have been appointed to the situations in model schools were appointed before being twenty-three years of age. In that case could they have earned their spurs in other schools?—A female teacher may be appointed at seventeen. We will say she is appointed at eighteen, and is, perhaps, a year or so in charge of a school. She then comes up to training here, and she distinguishes herself in training, and she is then transferred from the training school to the first vacancy in a model school, as assistant, if she would prefer being assistant in a model school to returning to her own.

24570. I was speaking of the head teachers in female and infant schools?—As to head teachers, the same thing would apply.

24571. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—The parties so appointed are supposed to possess superior qualifications?—Yes.

24572. There are head teachers of female and infant schools, generally two in each model school?—Yes; there are twenty-six infant school principal teachers in Ireland, and twenty-seven head mistresses.

24573. The Clergyman.—Have any of those had from five to ten years' experience as teachers of ordinary National schools?—Some of them have had more, but not many. I should think, have had ten years' experience. Many of them have had five. If they had only one or two years' experience, and came to be trained in the special class for two years, they certainly would have received sufficient experience to enable them to take charge of a model school.

24574. Mr. Sullivan.—Is it not the general rule that the teachers of model schools are generally selected from the special class of paid monitors and not teachers?—The special class is selected from the ordinary class, according to the superior abilities and attainments of the persons in that class.

24575. That was in former times?—It is the same rule still.

24576. At the present time how many of the class trained at Mulborough-street were actually teachers?—I cannot answer. I believe a return of that has been made. I think, with a very small exception, they were nearly all teachers, but perhaps not in charge of schools.

24577. Were twenty per cent. of the whole brought up non-teachers?—I don't know. It is easy to ascertain. It is a question of numbers.

24578. Is it not a matter of fact that since the reference of the Roman Catholic bishops was brought to bear upon teachers you have filled up the vacancies with persons who are not teachers, in order to keep up the number?—When there were vacancies we have brought persons who intended to become teachers, and pupil teachers and paid monitors to fill up the class.

24579. Have you not brought in some that were not paid monitors, recommended by the Commissioner?—Yes, but they were recommended because they were to be trained for schools, and many of those have obtained schools since.

24580. And these are generally the persons you recommended for the model schools?—I think not. I hardly ever knew of an instance of a person being transferred from the ordinary training class to a model school.

24581. Mr. Stokes.—Is there any case of a head teacher of a model school who was not trained at all in Ireland?—I remember only one case, there may be more. The teacher of the infant school in Keadarey, I think, was never trained, but she is a very superior woman.

24582. Do you remember the head teacher of the girls' school in Newry?—I do not.

24583. Would you not consider it would be a wrong upon trained teachers in Ireland to bring over

teachers trained in England?—No. We send trained teachers to England, I hope you don't consider it wrong.

24584. Sir Robert Kane.—Are you acquainted with the line of payment which is enforced now in England with regard to primary schools—that is as to payment by results?—I have paid some attention to it.

24585. Have you ever considered the applicability of that system to the schools in this country?—I have. I consider that in a modified form it could be beneficially applied, and I have written a paper on that subject, which I put in as evidence the last time I was examined here.

24586. I shall merely ask you is there anything you would wish to add at present to what you have already testified upon that subject?—Simply this, that I had written that paper a short time before this Commission brought me forward to be examined, and I did not know they would wish to make use of it. I have consulted some of the most practical inspectors in Ireland about it, and I asked them to test the system in their districts. In every instance I have secured the most favourable reports. They have shown that it can be worked beneficially for the interest of the schools, and that it would raise the income of the teachers considerably. I have some of their results here, if it is thought necessary to read them.

24587. Now, Mr. Cooke.—Would that be at the cost that I have set down?—It would be at the cost that I have set down. I made an estimate of it.

24588. What would it be according to your own estimate?—At present the grant is £370,000, and this would raise it to about £450,000 at once, and it would not be likely to exceed £500,000, carrying out the scheme in its fullest scope.

24589. You told Sir Robert Kane that you had the thing practically tested, and I want to know whether the estimate you made of the addition was borne out by the experiment?—The Inspectors did not go into the question of the estimate, but they said it would have the effect I represented of improving the condition of the teachers generally. According to my estimate, with the improved condition of the teachers, it would cost for each child educated about a mere few pence at present.

24590. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—They tested your plan of which the estimate forms a part?—Yes, without any reference to the estimate.

24591. Sir Robert Kane.—From the communications you have had with Inspectors and teachers through the country since you were last under examination, you have been led to conclude that the system of payment by results could be practically and economically carried out in the country?—Yes, e.g., giving a personal salary, so that the teacher may have something like a professional status, because if you deprive him of the personal salary, and resort to the system in operation in England of payment by results only, I think the condition of the teachers would be much worse than it is now.

24592. Are there any observations which you would wish to send to the Commission on the subject?—I would take the liberty of reading what has been said by Mr. Molloy, of Achy, who tested the matter in three schools.

24593. What is Mr. Molloy?—The District Inspector at Achy, and one of the most intelligent in the service. He says—

"In order to test the working of the scheme with reference to the grading of ordinary schools, I examined three schools in conjunction with it. Each of the schools selected fairly represented a large class. Of course, as no notice of the visit was given, 75 per cent. of the pupils on rolls were not in attendance. The result, therefore, in each case can be regarded only as an approximation. It convinced me, however, that the scheme would effect an improvement in the weak points of the schools, at the same time benefiting the deserving teachers. The first school had a mixed attendance, under a master classed III., without any local aid except school-dues, latter amounting to 47 or 48 per annum, the teacher's whole income from school being £42.

Henceforth this school barely escaped closure. Occasionally it might be said to be 'moderately effective.' With the inducements held out by the scheme this teacher could readily raise his income to £48. The second school was very favourably circumstanced as regards teacher's emoluments. Male school under a teacher classed IV., in receipt of good service salary (£115), with local endowment (£15), garden plot (10s.) and fees (£10), making total income of 145s. 10s. I cannot say that this teacher's school ever fully satisfied me. The junior pupils constantly fell short of what might be expected, while the seniors appeared to engross teacher's attention. The scheme would compel this teacher to improve the lower classes in the essential subjects, while teacher's comparatively high income would not suffer if he exerted himself to make the grade of his school correspond with his class. The third school (female) was under a mistress classed IV., with local endowment (£10), free residence (£6), and fees (£4 12s. 6d., total £30 12s. 6d. It has hitherto been efficiently conducted. Without difficulty second grade could be attained, so that teacher's income would be, by scheme, raised to £53 12s. 6d. I furnish the details of the examination in each case, in order that it may be seen whether I have deviated from the proposed plan in any way."

That is the testimony as to three schools, and everything is given in detail.

24594. Is it your opinion that there is nothing in the present administrative management of the Board inconsistent with the adoption of a system of partial payment by results?—Certainly, none that I can see.

24595. A plan of primary education has been more than once referred to by witnesses at this Commission, which would, to some extent, be substituted for the present system, and which may be stated to consist in the State entirely ignoring the subject of religious instruction, and looking solely to the secular teaching in schools—paying for that secular teaching on a scale somewhat rich as you have described—payment by results, with partial salary, and leaving it to the managers of the schools absolute liberty to have or have not religious instruction, and that instruction conducted according to any form at any time that they may decide. Do you consider that that system would present any advantages, in an educational or in a public point of view, over the system now in operation?—I think not, if I understand the question right, because such a system must be a denominational system. You say that the patron may give religious instruction whenever they choose, and how they choose, in the system that you describe. If so, it would be practically from that point of view a denominational system, and therefore exclusive, which, I think, would be a most unfortunate thing. I think any system in the country should be strictly non-denominational, and mixed as far as possible—such a system as we have at present; and I think that system should be applied, not only to Ireland, but to the three countries. In England, in the conscience clause, they are approaching it. In Scotland, from time immemorial, non-compulsion has been the practice, so that they are ripe for a change, and in the last report on the inquiry into the schools in Scotland, a non-denominational system is approved of.

24596. Do you consider the tendency of feeling among those persons who are conversant with educational matters in Great Britain, is rather towards a united system of education, and from the denominational?—I think it is certainly towards a non-denominational system, for I cannot look at the conscience clause in any other light. I see the bill, recently drafted out by Mr. Bruce, was in favour of a non-denominational system. That is the principle acknowledged in all the government institutions in this country, and I don't see why it should not be applied to schools as well.

24597. When you consider that the Commission in recommending, or the Government in adopting, a system such as I refer to, which is practically non-denominational, would be running contrary to the tendency of thought amongst the population of these countries?—I do.

24598. Do you consider that notwithstanding the

Feb. 16, 1869.

W.H. Stowell,  
Esq., S.S.

Feb. 16, 1893.

W. H. Newell,  
Cmpt. Acc.

strong representations that have been made in favour of the denominational system by the ecclesiastical authorities of the several churches in this country!—I do, decidedly. I think that the mixed system of education is the best adapted to this country, and I think if you adopt a denominational system of education, you will only create sectarian animosities and embittered feelings, and you will undo what you have been doing successfully, or partially successfully, for the last thirty years.

24599. Do you consider there would be any scope for sectarian animosity or bitterness with regard to religion if each denomination had its own school to go to, where it would be separate from any contact with others, and where all their religious observances would be carried out?—It is hard to say how you could have those schools to any extent generally through Ireland. The cases where you would have such schools would be exceptional, in consequence of the mixed character of the population, and by establishing a school of that kind in a district where there was a small religious minority, you would practically exclude the minority, and my notion is, that every citizen has a right to send his child to any school supported by the State without let or hindrance. In that case he could not without violating his conscience, so he would have to let his child go uneducated.

24600. What is the smallest number representing a minority, which you would consider the State justified in providing schools for?—That is a matter of opinion. The rules of the Board require an average of thirty children to entitle a school to full aid, but they give modified grants to smaller numbers—down to fifteen. They give inspection and books to a school of fifteen, and for a school of twenty a Protestant's salary. There are two-thirds of a Protestant's salary for fifteen.

24601. Might not minorities, when they have any sensible magnitude at all, be provided for by such small schools?—Small schools are generally inferior, and have bad teachers, and you do a wrong to the minority by giving them a bad teacher. If you left it a non-denominational school, free to all, they have the same advantages, and the children are bound together in harmony and unity, which is certainly most desirable in this country.

24602. Do you consider that the denominational system, if carried out in such a manner as that would have any financial advantages over the present system?—It would have many financial disadvantages, for it would lead to the multiplication of schools. You must have a school for each sect, whereas if you carry out the mixed system carefully, you need not have so many schools, and therefore the mixed system is a cheaper system to the State in any country than the denominational system.

24603. Which would you consider preferable, a system under which the State would ignore the consideration of religious instruction, and concern itself with the imparting only of secular instruction, or a system under which the State would recognize the necessity for religious instruction, but impose a conscience clause for the purpose of protecting the faith of the minority?—I prefer the system with the conscience clause. I consider the National system in Ireland as one great conscience clause. It is a system which I consider, both in the abstract and in practice, the best as it now stands.

24604. Do you think it desirable on the part of the State to secure a certain religious element in the course of study carried on in the schools?—The State does not in the present system undertake to secure religious instruction to the children, but it affords every facility for doing so, and I think that is all required of the State to do. I think the State is not bound to provide religious instruction. I think if it provides a good secular instruction, and leaves the religious instruction free, that is all that is required of it.

24605. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is it not the opinion of many supporters of the system that they do secure a

great deal of general religious instruction?—Practically it is so. There is general religious instruction permeating our reading books, but that is in almost all reading books used in schools, but separate special religious instruction is not provided for by the State. It is given either before secular instruction or after secular instruction, or it is given intermediately.

24606. Do you Board support any schools where there is no religion taught at all?—They do.

24607. Where are these schools?—I was looking over some returns that have been called for by the Royal Commission, and I found that in some parts of the north of Ireland there are schools where no religious instruction is given. I know only one myself of that sort, but there are about 100 schools throughout Ireland in which the parents give no religious instruction beyond what may be collected from the books, and the children retire to church or chapel for religious instruction.

24608. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware the same applies to schools in the south, such as Athlone?—I was not aware. I suppose that is one of the schools I mention.

24609. Sir Robert Kane.—Would not these schools be somewhat in the position of the system I referred to a short time ago, where the State entirely ignores the subject of religious instruction?—Quite so, but I think such schools would not be generally acceptable to the country, that is, I do not think a purely secular system would be acceptable to the country.

24610. Would you call it a purely secular system where it was open to the managers of the schools to introduce as much religion as they thought proper?—Certainly not. I would consider that was a system under which they had an opportunity of providing religious instruction if they wished. It would also carry with it the privilege of permitting them to give that religious instruction when and how they pleased; therefore it would make the schools exclusive unless there was a conscience clause.

24611. Would you think it likely in those parts of the country where there are small Protestant minorities and where a Board school would be under direct management, and with the sympathies and assistance of the local territorial proprietors, that that school if payment depended on the attendance of those children there would be strong temptation to induce Roman Catholics to go to that school, and thereby endanger their faith?—I think there would be a strong temptation and inducement, generally throughout Ireland, from my knowledge both of the clergy and of the landlords.

24612. Do you think the tendency towards proselytism was in that way become greater under such a denominational assistance?—I think it would be very much increased.

24613. Would not the State then be accused of directly subsidizing schools which were in their practical action proselytizing?—No doubt, it would be accused. It would be accused by the opposite party.

24614. And would your position then be anything better than it is now?—I think it would be a great deal worse. I think you would have a field for religious discussions of the very worst character, which always in this country when carried to any extent was a political aspect, and I think you would create the worst feelings possible in the locality in which such a school existed.

24615. You think then on the whole the plan of leaving managers of schools perfectly free to exercise their discretion as to the mode and manner of giving religious instruction would not tend to remove the difficulties we now find with regard to religion and proselytizing in the National schools?—My conviction is that it would increase these.

24616. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—It has been alleged that the Commissioners of National education, or several of them, are disposed to administer the present system denominationally. Would you be disposed to give your opinion on that subject?—I don't think I could venture to give my opinion on that subject.



24617. You prefer not—I should rather not.

24618. Are you aware that Archbishop Whately in his evidence before the Lords' Committee in 1854, testified that such was the case even then?—I think I recollect so, but I have not read that evidence for a long time.

24619. Would you be kind as to read his evidence on page 188 in this book in answer to question 1334?—Shall I read the question?

24620. Yes?—Is not the object "(Lord Beaumont said) "of population your goods rather than the circumstances of their being persons of different religious persuasions in the locality?—There has been a strong recently shown by some members of the Board towards the establishment, virtually, of a separate system, that is of having a Protestant school and a Roman Catholic school in those places, where it could be established. I, for one, have always set my face against that, and endeavored to have one school as fully as possible conducted in each locality where one school is sufficient, taking care that there should be no reasonable impediment against children of both persuasions frequenting it."

24621. Would you answer this question—were not the Commissioners first appointed, or amongst the earlier appointments of the Board, more firm, not to my faithful, in the administration of the system as a united system, than since the increase of the Commissioners?—I would say the number having been smaller, there might have been less pressure brought to bear upon them than upon a large number. The larger the number is the more in heed of the feelings and wants of the people, and of course they would have to give expression to them on the Board as representing these parties.

24622. Are you aware that Archbishop Whately also testified that the Commissioners introduced at a later period, but antecedent to 1854, were more disposed to administer the system inconsistently with its original principles as a system of united education than previously?—I have forgotten about that.

24623. Will you turn to question 1431?—Yes?—Does not the fact that Mr. Crow admitted, and which I think your Grace has rather admitted, of separate grants having been made to schools under different systems of management at the same place the population of which was not sufficiently large to require it, to a certain extent show, that it was the opinion of the Commissioners that it did not work well as a system of united education?—Read the answer?—There are some of the Commissioners who have always been advocates for a system of separate grants. I was not one of them, Mr. Elliot was not one of them, Archbishop Murray was not of them, and I think some of the original Commissioners were of that opinion, but some who were introduced afterwards were for joining, some of them partially, to one particular side, and others were for yielding to any which proved locally on them. I have known the some persons advocate concessions to the Protestant patron on the one hand, and concessions to the Roman Catholic on the other, in their respective demands, each being inconsistent with our system, and each tending to make the schools of an exclusive character."

24624. Have you reason to believe that pressure itself brought to bear on so large a body as the present body of Commissioners?—I don't know about the pressure being brought to bear on the Commissioners, but there are, in many instances, schools under patrons of different religious persuasions, if there is a sufficient attendance in the locality.

24625. The question is, is that administering the system denominationally?—It certainly appears as if the schools were denominationally, but then the principle of the system is observed in each school. A school is constituted, the manager undertakes to observe the rules of the Board, and the rights of conscience are protected.

24626. There is a conscience clause for the protection of the minority?—Certainly.

\*The unpublished portion of Mr. Keenan's Report here referred to will be found in the Appendix to Evidence, No. XVII.

24627. Notwithstanding the generous action of the Commissioners to please the different denominations, is it not the fact that in a very large number of National schools in the south and west of Ireland there is found a small Protestant minority?—It is a fact.

24628. I have in my hand returns from several districts in the South and West, showing that in nearly all National schools, even under a Roman Catholic manager, and Roman Catholic teacher, a few Protestant children attend. From your experience do you believe that to be a fact?—It is a fact. The last report shows the numbers.

24629. I wish to ask you a question with regard to your previous evidence. You said Inspectors were promoted for merit irrespective of religion?—I did, and I made a partial mistake.

24630. And are you aware another witness said they were promoted according to their religious denominations?—Yes, I am—I am aware that he did.

24631. Have you any explanation to offer?—Well, when I made that statement, I remembered that two Presbyterian inspectors had been promoted to vacancies held by Church of England men, and I thought a like rule would be extended on the merits of the case to a Protestant, if a Catholic vacancy occurred, or to a Catholic, if there was a Protestant vacancy. Since I have had the honor of appearing before the Royal Commissioners, two vacancies did occur in the second class—one a Roman Catholic, and one a Protestant—and the matter was brought before the Board by me. I recommended that two Roman Catholics should be promoted, because they were senior, and they were numerous, and they were promoted accordingly; and, therefore, that was carrying out my view.

24632. On the ground of merit?—On the ground of merit, but at the next Board that decision was reversed, and one Roman Catholic was put back, and a Protestant was put in his place, in lieu of the Protestant who made the vacancy, so that I was wrong partially.

24633. The Resident Commissioner was under examination a few days ago, and undertook to furnish a copy of an unpublished report of Mr. Keenan, in the year 1858, and also a copy of the minute of the Board disapproving of Mr. Keenan's recommendation, with the names of the Commissioners present?—He directed me to prepare that copy.

24634. Have you it?—No; I ordered it to be sent to you. I got a memorandum saying, "Dr. Wilson has asked for this return, will you send it to him?" I told the clerk to get it ready, and he prepared, by direction of the Resident Commissioner, the return called for.

24635. Did you not receive a communication from me to-day directed to the Secretaries, stating the minutes on the subject were designed for the use of the Royal Commissioners?—I was not at the office for more than half an hour; I heard nothing of it.

24636. Will you undertake to furnish that return?—Certainly, the return is ready. I saw it yesterday. Is it to be sent to the Secretaries?

24637. Here to the Royal Commission?—Shall I bring it with me?

24638. Yes?—I shall do so.

24639. With regard to the model school system. Is that a new feature of the National system of education?—I think not. I think model schools were contemplated from the first; so early as the year '53, I should think. In 1833, Mr. Haughton, an Inspector, recommended minor model schools for different parts of Ireland, and the Commissioners themselves, in their second report, recommended thirty-two model schools to be established throughout the country.

24640. Do you recollect Earl Mulgrave's statement with regard to the establishment of these schools, vol. 1, p. 20, of the Commissioners' Reports?—No, I do not.

24641. What was the original design of these model schools?—The Commissioners themselves state in their 14th report, that model schools, so originally

Feb. 16, 1869.

W. H. Stowell,  
Clerk.

Feb 16, 1869. contemplated were designed to give full efficiency to the National system.

W H Stowell,  
esq., LL.B.

24642 In what respect?—Well, I suppose as representing samples of the best class of National schools, and as models for the schools in the district.

24643 Did not the Commissioners expressly declare that their design was to have trained teachers in connection with them for all their schools?—That was one of their objects. They regarded them, as stated in one of their reports, as preliminary training schools.

24644 They were designed as such by the Commissioners, and sanctioned by the Executive Government, to be primary training schools. Were they not for training teachers already in charge of schools, as you say?—I never heard that.

24645 You cannot furnish a proof of that?—I cannot.

24646 Are you not aware that in the absence of the leave training school premises in trustees, appended to the report for 1842, the following remarkable promise is stated:—"All teachers, male and female, teaching in schools connected with the Board, either after their appointment or previously, shall hold themselves in readiness when called on to attend at the general normal establishment in Dublin, or at one of the district model schools hereafter to be opened." Do you recollect that?—Yes, I remember that.

24647 And are you not aware of teachers being so trained in any of these schools?—That is, do I know an instance of a teacher in charge of National schools being trained at a model school?

24648 Yes?—I do not remember any.

24649 You are not aware this took place in any model school?—If it did, it was irregular.

24650 In accordance with that rule?—That is a rule which is more honored in the breach than in the observance.

24651 There were special rules and instructions laid down for model schools?—They were for training pupil teachers. They were regarded as preliminary training schools, and if an inspector found a teacher in any of his schools who was young and deficient, he might bring him in as a pupil teacher, but he must have entered the model school as a pupil teacher—not as a National school teacher.

24652 Are we to understand the Commissioners do not carry out their own rules?—They do not carry out that rule.

24653 Rev. Mr. Cross.—Did you not encourage teachers to come down?—We encourage that, but the practice has fallen into disuse.

24654 When I was in Belfast there was a teacher in the model school, and I asked him particularly what he was doing there. He said he was watching the whole thing, and trying to learn what they were doing in the training school. Was that what the Board intended when they meant the model schools as training schools?—I think it was a permanent attendance that they intended.

24655 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you consider that as training?—No, I should not.

24656 Are you aware it has been stated in the report of the Commissioners that they never intended these model schools to be training schools?—I think some one of the Board's officers stated something of that sort.

24657 Did the Commissioners themselves ever issue any statement to that effect?—I don't remember.

24658 Did the Board continue for a length of time to press upon the Government the creation of additional model schools?—Yes.

24659 Do you recollect the testimony of Mr. Cross, the secretary to the Commissioners, with regard to the establishment of these schools?—I recollect generally it was very favorable. I have not read it for seven or eight years.

24660 And of Dean Meyer, one of the Roman Catholic Commissioners?—Yes, I believe it was favorable, too, but I don't remember it.

24661 Do you recollect the evidence of Mr. Cross,

given before the Leeds Committee, in answer to the question, "Will you tell the committee whether you think that your system for training teachers will be completed until your system of district model schools is fully established?"—"The system of training will not be fully developed until these district model schools be established?"—No.

24662 And before that same committee Dean Meyer said in reply to question 2,638—"Your lordship adverts to only one object of the schools. Besides a school for the instruction of the children of Dunmurry, it is a model school affording to the neighborhood, and to the hundreds of schools in the district, the best example of school keeping and management, and four pupil teachers and some of the monitor and pupils are sent out at the end of each year as well trained and qualified teachers. It is not merely designed for the instruction of that number of scholars, but it has another function, as a training institution, and one economically carried on." Do you recollect that as having been Dean Meyer's testimony?—No, I do not.

24663 Do you consider that as being the design of the model schools?—Entirely.

24664 Now have not the Commissioners themselves in their reports, and in their evidence before committees, and their secretaries, been witness to this testimony that the training of teachers was the main object of the model schools?—I think so. I think that is to be collected from their reports.

24665 Then should you regard it as true to say that they were designed merely as a superior class of ordinary schools?—I think the evidence and the statements in the Commissioners' various reports is opposed to that.

24666 You have seen the explanatory paper of the Commissioners in which they say that they require a certain number of teachers to be trained annually—do you recollect the number?—About 900, I think.

24667 What do you say in the number of trained teachers annually required to keep up the supply?—I think as long as the teaching staff is so undependable as it is at present the number will go on increasing every year, for my opinion is the faster you train teachers the faster you lose them, unless you increase their pay. You give them higher qualifications, and they will seek employment or service in some other field, so that the thing to do is to stop this waste by giving them better pay, and then you could more easily determine what would be the number required each year.

24668 Are you aware the Commissioners themselves said they required 700 teachers trained annually, and that their model schools could supply only 124. Should you regard that as an accurate statement?—The Commissioners consider the teachers of model schools as trained in a preliminary way. I think one model school should be made to turn out eight pupil teachers on the average, if they had only one year's training. That would be eight times nineteen—152.

24669 Have you only nineteen model schools?—Nineteen district model schools, and seven infant model schools.

24670 How many did the Belfast Model School turn out in one year?—There was a statement made by Dr. Patton and Mr. Molloy that it turned out a very large number.

24671 What was the design of establishing the first-class monitorships?—It was said to supply a want between the senior paid monitor and the teachers.

24672 What do you mean by supplying a want? What is that want?—That the senior paid monitor, having completed his time, was not ripe to take charge of a National school, and that he ought then to hold another office for a year or two if he showed any aptitude for his profession, and that from amongst the senior monitors should be selected persons for this office; and they called the office that they created that of first-class monitor.

24673 Was the reason assigned a sufficient one in your opinion?—I don't think the first-class monitors were required at all.

24674. Was there any such want?—I say I don't think there was.

24675. What is the age under which candidates for the office of paid monitor cannot be appointed?—Fourteen is the age at which senior monitors ought to be appointed; then, if they remain four years in the service, that would bring them to eighteen years, when they are eligible to take charge of a National school.

24676. Then it follows that a paid monitor should be at the least eighteen years at the close of his term of office?—He ought to be.

24677. And is it not the rule that if a paid monitor goes through the course in a satisfactory manner, he is eligible to offer as a candidate for an assistant teachership?—Certainly.

24678. So that every senior monitor, at the conclusion of his time of service, must be at least eighteen years, and may be twenty?—He may be twenty, and must be eighteen; but then senior monitors are sometimes appointed as an earlier age than fourteen.

24679. Does it not follow that every male monitor who would be qualified to take charge of a school, according to the Board's own rule, if he served his whole time, must be at least a year over, and a female monitor at least two years over the qualifying age?—Yes.

24680. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—If a monitor was appointed head teacher of an infant school at the age of seventeen, would that be according to the ordinary rules of the Board?—I think that would be an extreme case indeed; it should be an extremely brilliant person that would get such an appointment.

24681. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Taking your own rule as the standard, where is the interval of two years to which reference was made in that statement of the Commissioners?—There is no interval. The only excuse I could see for it was that it was found the paid monitors did not obtain schools when they had served their four years, and that they were then retained in the service, sooner than less their services, for a year or two extra.

24682. What schools benefited by this arrangement?—Large schools; their services were to be confined to schools with large attendances.

24683. And, as a matter of fact, what were these schools?—As a matter of fact they were principally convent schools, as they had the largest attendance.

24684. Was the object put forward by the Commissioners gained by the arrangements then made?—Will you read the object?

24685. The object was to furnish a sufficient supply of trained teachers by means of "first-class monitorships." Was that object gained?—I cannot answer that question positively. I can well understand if you create a grade of first-class monitors, it will induce those below them to remain a longer time in the service, in order that they may derive the benefit of increased pay.

24686. As a matter of fact, was there an increase of monitors?—I think there is an increase of monitors this year, or was last year.

24687. And prior to the time when this new regulation was passed?—I think monitors have gone on increasing every year up to this.

24688. How the number of first-class monitors goes on increasing since this arrangement?—There has been a decrease in the males and an increase in the females.

24689. The Chairman.—Did you ever expect that would be a numerous class?—No, I did not expect it to be a numerous class. The very large schools are not a numerous class.

24690. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—At the time the first-class monitors were appointed to the "large" schools was not the number counterbalanced by an equal diminution in the staff of pupil-teachers and monitors in the district model schools?—The year these first-class monitors were introduced there was a reduction of the staff in the model schools, but I don't presume to say that the two changes were in any way related.

24691. Did they counter as to time?—Yes, I think it was the same year.

24692. By whose order did the reduction take place?—The reduction took place by order of the Board. No reduction could take place without the order of the Board.

24693. They reduce the number in their own model schools, and increase them in another department?—I think that is a fact, but in that way, but the reduction of the model schools has been called a rectification.

24694. Do you call it a reduction or a rectification?—I call it a reduction.

24695. Did the public service, then, reap any benefit whatever by this change?—No doubt the schools in which the first-class monitors were appointed derived benefit from their appointment.

24696. I asked a question as to the public service. Did the public service generally derive any benefit by this change?—I must answer that question by saying that if the reduction in the one case was as great as the increase in the other, I should say not; but I am not prepared to say how the numbers stand.

24697. The Chairman.—Was that reduction pressed upon the Commissioners by Government from motives of economy, or did it originate with the Commissioners themselves?—I never heard there was any pressure put upon the Board by the Government on that subject. It was done, I think, by the Committee who were preparing the estimates.

24698. And was the teaching power of the model schools in excess of the number of pupils?—In some places the teaching power was in excess, and that caused a question with regard to the number of pupil-teachers that should be in model schools. There was an undertaking before to learn a certain number in model schools, and I never knew the staff to be reduced, because the number of pupils became smaller from time to time.

24699. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Did not the reduction take place contemporaneously with the Commissioners' statement that the model schools were unable to supply the demand for trained teachers?—I think contemporaneously. The paper itself will show that.

24700. Now, at the time they made this statement as to the inability of those model schools to supply trained teachers, what was their action in connexion with their educational estimate for 1864, can you say?—The action as regarded the annual estimate could only be one. The Commissioners must have applied for a sum of money to meet the expenditure, consequent on the appointment of first-class monitors, and they reduced the estimate by the number of pupil-teachers whose services were dispensed with.

24701. Wasn't the reduction in the estimate, owing to the order for the reduction of the number of pupil-teachers in connexion with the model schools?—Will you let me understand the question.

24702. That was reduction in the estimates for the model school department, and, consequent on this reduction, did they propose any addition in any other direction, and what direction?—There may have been—I don't recollect all the particulars in connexion with the proposition of that estimate. I remember that a sum of money was proposed for the payment of first-class monitors.

24703. What was a very general opinion of the public as to this policy?—I remember there was a good deal of agitation in the public press, in the north I think.

24704. What means have the Commissioners of knowing the wants of the country as to teachers?—Is it not through their own officers?—Certainly.

24705. About the time they said they required about 700 teachers annually do you recollect what was the testimony of any of their own officers. In fact I refer to your own testimony, if it has not escaped your recollection?—It has not.

24706. You considered that the number was very much under that, and that the Commissioners made too high an estimate as to the recruitment of the staff?—Yes.

Feb. 16, 1869.

W. B. Sewell,  
secy., &c. &c.

Feb. 16, 1903.  
W. B. Newell,  
Esq., &c. &c.

24707. And in your report in 1898 the following statement appears:—

"Small as is the number of paid monitors in ordinary schools attaining to a service of four years, there is a difficulty of making provision for them in the Board's service as teachers. . . . As to finding employment for the paid monitors now in the service as teachers of National schools, even should only one-fourth of the whole number remain to complete the last year of their office, there is no possibility of such a result. The number of vacancies for teachers that occurs in my district does not, on the average, exceed 40—45 in a district exceeding over one-ninth of the whole kingdom."

That was the case in the ten districts in my circuit; but I assumed that all the paid monitors would become teachers.

24708. Supposing 700 teachers actually wanted, have you reason to believe the model schools could have supplied more than 130?—I think the model schools could be made to supply more than 130—that is, including males and females.

24709. Would it be true if it was said many young persons had their hopes blighted by this action of the Board—who had been in consequence of it obliged to return to their homes?—I think that is an extreme assertion.

24710. Is it not the fact that the reduction order of the Commissioners caused the return of several parties to their homes, and that they were obliged to return from these model schools?—I think the order was un-understood. Only a few were sent away before the expiration of their time. It is not a fact that a good many were sent away.

24711. Mr. Fleming was a Head Inspector in December, '63. You knew Mr. Fleming as Head Inspector?—Yes, I did.

24712. His district, I think, was the district including Ballymoney and Derry. Are you not aware the Board's order for reduction affected the six model schools in his charge, and enjoined a large diminution in the staff at Ballymoney, Derry, Coltrane, Newtownstewart, Omagh, and Sligo?—I don't remember anything about the numbers. I could not at this time. It never occurred to me to look at them since, but the pupil-teachers were not obliged to go away until the expiration of their period of service, and then their places were not filled up.

24713. The same reduction order of the Board applied to a large number of districts. I have also to ask you did not the district inspectors, Protestant and Roman Catholic, remonstrate against the reduction?—Several letters of remonstrance were received.

24714. Did not several of them say that the efficiency of the model schools, even at common schools, was interfered with?—I think I remember something to that effect in some of the letters.

24715. And that in some the staff was so reduced that the supply of teachers was inadequate, and that in teaching power they were not as well off as in the ordinary National schools in the neighbourhood?—I don't remember that statement; I remember a general complaint.

24716. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is the number of pupil-teachers and monitors whom we have found in model schools during the last year on the reduced scale, or has it risen to the old scale?—In some places it has risen, and in other places it remains as it was. I don't know that there would be any objection now to recur to the old number.

24717. The Chairman.—Do you consider that the finding of a school of ten children and a teacher to teach is discreditable?—I would not consider it discreditable; but, regarding the fact that the school was considered a training school as well as a day school, I think the pupil-teachers in training ought not to be removed, while there is a certain number of pupils in the day schools to receive instruction from them, because their training can go on effectively.

24718. I meant that in reference to the remark of Dr. Wilson, that it has been stated in the reports of the Inspectors were very much crippled owing to the want of teachers?—Yes.

24719. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you say that under these circumstances the Commissioners neglected the design of the model schools as training establishments?—I should only say I was sorry to see the staff reduced. It would not be for one of their offices to pass censure on the Commissioners. I could not do it. I say I only regret the staff was reduced.

24720. Are you aware that Head Inspectors and District Inspectors have stated that the reduction, although applicable to some of them, if considered only as ordinary National schools, was not applicable to them as model schools, as they were designed to be for the training of young persons for the office of teacher?—That was an argument used in controversy.

24721. And that some Inspectors declared with regard to another model school, that further reduction could not be made without detriment?—Yes.

24722. Have you seen that correspondence?—Yes. I remember the general tenor of the correspondence.

24723. Is Mr. Sweeney an officer of the Board?—He is.

24724. Is not Mr. Sweeney District Inspector for Lurgan?—We had him acting as Inspector. He was originally a teacher, and did duty for an Inspector who was ill.

24725. Are you aware he represented the staff of the model schools as inadequate, as not being so adequate as that of the ordinary National schools?—I don't remember.

24726. Are you not aware that Mr. Bole, District Inspector, in relation to the school at Ballyborough, where the school was pronounced to be a great success, and where the staff was greatly reduced, protested against any further reduction as most injurious?—I think I have a recollection of Mr. Bole's statement.

24727. And are you aware that Mr. Osborne remonstrated against the proposed reduction with regard to Newtownards, and especially as the school was increasing in number?—I don't remember that.

24728. Had you not also a remonstrance with regard to the reduction of the staff in the Belfast Model School?—I think there was a remonstrance.

24729. Mr. Gales.—How many of the Commissioners now on the Board were on the Board in 1884, when Archbishop Whately gave this evidence?—There are six of those mentioned in this report who were on the Board at that time.

24730. Are you aware of any of the facts on which Archbishop Whately came to that conclusion?—No.

24731. Is it about that time the Newry Model Schools were opened, and that the Scriptures were recited?—I am not aware on what Archbishop Whately founded his argument. I have not read his Grace's evidence for nine or ten years.

[Adjourned.]

SIXTY-FIFTH DAY.—DUBLIN, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1869.

PRESENT :

The Right Hon. The Earl of PARRIS, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, *K.R.*  
 The Right Hon. Lord CLONBROCK  
 The Right Hon. Mr. JUSTICE MOHR.  
 Sir ROBERT KANE, *P.R.*  
 WILLIAM BROOK, *Esq.*, *M.C.*  
 Rev. DAVID WILSON, *D.D.*

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, *D.D.*  
 JAMES ARTHUR DWYER, *Esq.*  
 JAMES GIBSON, *Esq.*, *Q.C.*  
 SCOTT NASMYTH STOKES, *Esq.*  
 WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, *Esq.*, *M.D.*

GEORGE A. O'NEILL, *Esq.*, *Q.C.*, } *Secretaries*  
 D. B. DUNNE, *Esq.*

W. H. NEWELL, *Esq.*, *M.B.*, further examined.

Feb 17, 1869.

W. H. Newell,  
Esq., A.B.

24732. Rev. Dr. WILSON.—For what year was the published report of Mr. Keenan which the Resident Commissioner undertook to furnish?—I think the year 1858.\*

24733. What was the purport of the portion of his report which was unpublished?—I read it this morning, and that portion of it refers to a proposition for the establishment of non-vested model schools.

24734. On what plan?—On a plan similar to the other schools, but that they should be non-vested, be supported by the State, and should train teachers in the same way as the vested model schools. I gather this from a cursory reading of the paper.

24735. Are you aware of the proposed plan of Mr. Fortescue in his letter bearing upon schools of this description throughout the country?—I have read it.

24736. Was Mr. Keenan's plan of 1858 similar to that?—On that head the provisions are somewhat similar.

24737. Then this proposed plan of Mr. Fortescue is not a new one?—Not so far as regards the non-vested model schools.

24738. In whose interest was it suggested that such a plan should be carried out?—Is it Mr. Keenan's?

24739. Yes?—I could not say.

24740. Did that plan come under the consideration of the Commissioners of National Education?—Yes.

24741. Did they come to any resolution upon the subject?—They came to a resolution which is embodied in their minutes.

24742. Read that minute please?—It is:—"The Secretary lays before the Commissioners Mr. Keenan's report proposed to be included in the appendix to the Twenty-fifth Report and calls attention to the passage at page 183-4, designated 'training'—Ordered that the passage read be expunged, and that Mr. Tison be authorized to cancel the sheet in which it is contained, it appearing to the Commissioners that the plan proposed by Mr. Keenan for the establishment of non-vested model schools involves an organic change in the system. The Commissioners also decline to sanction Mr. Keenan's further proposal that the present district model schools should be altered in their constitution so as to serve as training schools for national teachers in addition to the other object they were designed to carry out."

24743. What is the date of that minute of the Board?—The 2nd December, 1859.

24744. Then do not the Commissioners specifically declare that this proposed scheme was "an organic change" in the system of National united education?—Yes.

24745. Who were the Commissioners present?—The Right Hon. Maitre Brady, Lord Chancellor; The Marquis of Kildare, Sir Thomas Redington, Dr. Andrew, James Gibson, Esq., Rev. Dr. Hall, and the Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell.

24746. The *Gazette*?—In 1859 did the Commissioners not regard the district model schools as places for training masters?—According to this minute they did not, and as I explained yesterday, I think they

never have regarded them as final training institutions in the sense in which they look upon the central department, but as practically preliminary training institutions.

24747. Mr. DEANE.—How many Roman Catholic members of the Board were present on the occasion, according to the list you have read from?—One.

24748. Rev. Dr. WILSON.—Did the Commissioners approve in general of the plan suggested by Mr. Fortescue?—All the Commissioners do you mean?

24749. Yes?—No, there was a division in the Board. I remember that there was a minority of three of those present.

24750. How many were present?—I think there were nine present on that occasion.

24751. Then having declared in 1859 that Mr. Keenan's plan was "an organic change" in connection with the system, and having approved of the plan of Mr. Fortescue at a later period, should you regard the action of the Commissioners as trifling?—Not on that subject, for it is contradictory.

24752. Rev. Mr. COWIE.—I want to ask some questions about the model schools. Does your scheme contemplate that the teachers in model schools—?—Which scheme do you refer to?

24753. The scheme now in operation—the plan under which you now administer—do you contemplate that they should give instruction in mathematics, mechanics, physical science, drawing, and navigation?—These are all taught in the model schools in connection with the Board, in some one or other of them.

24754. Now if you provide a teacher of physical science, do you give him extra pay for teaching physical science?—If he should teach the subject satisfactorily he is entitled to a gratuity of £10 at the end of the year.

24755. Not more than £10?—I think £10 is the maximum.

24756. Then is not the payment which the teachers derive from another department of the Government rather in excess?—For example, I take Belfast, where Mr. Dearty received in 1858 £125; and three teachers in Belfast received £145; and three teachers at Newtownards received £396; and at Tynm the teacher received £105. Have you any documents which will tell us upon what subjects these sums were earned?—I have for one year—the year 1867—a document showing the books that were issued for conveying the instruction, the number of hours devoted to each subject, the number of pupils attending, the rates of payment, the total amount of fees received, and the amount received from the Science and Art Department.

24757. Take the case of Belfast—what were the subjects there?—Elementary mathematics, theory of mechanics, acoustics, light, heat, electricity, and magnetism.

24758. You may call that mathematics, mechanics, and physical science?—Yes; all the other branches

\* The unpublished portion of Mr. Keenan's report here referred to will be found in the Appendix to Evidence, No. XVII.  
 7 B 2

Feb. 27, 1869.

W. H. Russell,  
Clerk, &c.

come under the head of physical science. They are treated separately, however, in the directory of the Department of Science and Art.

24759. In your principal teacher in Belfast model school bound to give instruction in mathematics for the remuneration he receives from the National Board?—Our principal teacher is, and so are such of the assistants as he may direct to take charge of the classes.

24760. Does he direct Mr. R. Smith, or is he an assistant?—He is the drawing master.

24761. Does he direct Mr. Wren?—He is an assistant master, and has charge of the physical science from the Commissioners.

24762. Is he paid from your Board for teaching physical science?—Yes, under the conditions I have mentioned. He has received the gratuity, for he is an efficient teacher.

24763. And that does not exceed £101—£110.

24764. In May, 1868, he received £152 10s. from the Science and Art Department. Can you say what he received in 1867?—In the year 1866, to which I refer, he received £72 from the Department of Science and Art.

24765. Is it the intention of the Commissioners that the remuneration of these teachers should chiefly depend on the Science and Art Department?—The Commissioners of National Education have nothing to say to it. It is quite outside the instruction given in their schools. The teachers have a connection, commensurate with the position of the Department of Science and Art, they open their classes, and the Inspector, on round at appointed times and examines them, and according to the number of passes the premiums are awarded.

24766. At what hour did Mr. Wren give instruction in physical science?—Four hours weekly.

24767. At what time of the day?—I cannot say. It must have been outside the Commissioners' hours.

24768. Take the case of Mr. Joyce, at the central model school, in Dublin?—I have not got the statistics of that case here, but I know a good deal about it.

24769. On what subjects does he prepare students for the Department of Science and Art?—I can only tell for this year.

24770. Do you know of last year?—I do not know of last year.

24771. What are the subjects this year?—Physical geography and the theory of mechanics.

24772. Are you able to tell me what subjects he had last year when he received £50 5s.?—I am not sure of the subjects. It would only be conjecture if I were to say. He told me of them a year ago.

24773. Is it your impression that these subjects were outside the course prescribed for him by the Board?—He has told me himself that he considered some of the money he received was scarcely fairly earned, because the subjects which were obligatory to them were taught in the school daily.

24774. In the case of Bellebrough, can you say what Mr. Doherty received in any year?—In the year 1867, according to this return, he received £125 5s.

24775. For what subjects?—Elementary mechanics and physical geography—the books of the Board's course and Colenso.

24776. Do you think the payment of the Board is sufficient to require of your teachers that they should give the instruction which the Board requires?—I think that the payment of the Commissioners is sufficient to secure the object that they have in view, which is to give instruction in physical science to such pupils attending the model schools as may choose to learn that branch.

24777. Do these pupils pay themselves extra fees for these subjects?—No.

24778. Are there any instances where payments of considerable amount have been received from South Kensington, when your Board refused a gratuity for efficient teaching?—I don't think there is an instance. A question arose about one case in which the Inspec-

tor hesitated to sign a certificate, but I think there was only one case, and the subjects were different.

24779. I have a case here mentioned in which a teacher had got a comparatively large sum, something like £100, from the Science and Art Department, and the Commissioners refused to give the ordinary £10, because the classes were not in the satisfactory condition that the Commissioners expected?—That would be so if the elementary subjects were not thoroughly taught, in which case, the Commissioners will not pay for the higher subjects.

24780. Do you think such a state of things as this where a teacher may turn a large sum from another department of the Government and neglect his own work, is at all satisfactory?—I think in this case it works unfavourably to the interest of the schools.

24781. Does Mr. Joyce teach drawing in Dublin?—No.

24782. Look at the Newtownards school in that paper you have before you, and see what Mr. Harrison taught there?—In 1863 he taught physical geography—in 1867 he taught natural philosophy, elementary mathematics, and geology.

24783. What did Mr. Groer teach at Newtownards?—I find I have made a mistake. Mr. Groer taught natural philosophy, Mr. Harrison, physical geography, and Mr. Scott, assistant, taught elementary mathematics and geology.

24784. Are you aware that in last May, 1868, these three masters received £396 5s. from the Government?—I see that Mr. Harrison received £98, Mr. Groer, £265, and the sum that Mr. Scott received is not returned.

24785. What is Mr. Harrison's salary from the Board, do you know?—I am not sure that he is still a master, but if he is his salary is £100.

24786. In the case of Trum, I see that Mr. Froehel, who is at the maximum, receives £100 1s.—Yes.

24787. What subjects does he teach which enabled him in 1868 to get £103 more from South Kensington? I cannot say what they were in 1868, but I see here in one year, which is not mentioned, he taught astronomy, light and heat.

24788. And how much did he earn?—In that year £37 10s.

24789. Do you not think it would be a proper thing that some different regulation should be adopted with respect to teachers in model schools (supposing these gratuities are to go on), and teachers in elementary schools. Are not teachers in model schools hitherto paid?—The teachers in ordinary schools would receive gratuities for physical science if they introduced it into their schools.

24790. Would it not be a just thing that the teachers in model schools should get a less sum from the Board for teaching these subjects?—If they perform the same labours for the Department of Science and Art they ought to get the same rate, but I think the rate is excessive, and the whole scheme is faulty.

24791. Do you know how many National school teachers receive gratuities from the Science and Art Department?—His Lordship having called attention to it, I looked over the list last night, and I think there are about forty-four National schools, including model schools, receiving gratuities. Altogether in Ireland, there are about seventy-five. The whole particulars are given here in the directory published by the Department of Science and Art.

24792. May not such payments as £126 to Mr. Doherty, the teacher at Bellebrough, be considered relatively an over payment?—I should say so, and the teachers, or one at least, excused himself to me by saying that "very little money comes to Ireland from the other side, and for goodness sake don't interfere, but let us have it." I say, certainly it is a bad principle.

24793. Do the masters of elementary schools receive anything like the same allowance by the model school masters?—I should think not, but I cannot speak positively on that subject. They are sure not to be so effective. In the first place they are rarely so well

trained, and in the second place they have not got the apparatus.

24794. I understood you to say it is distinctly against the rules of the Board that the teachers should give the instruction during the hours belonging to the Commissioners?—In the model schools that I have attended, physical science was taught outside the Commissioners' hours. I think that is a positive rule.

24795. Might not elementary mathematics be part of the ordinary course of instruction?—I refer to physical science. Elementary mathematics are taught daily within the hours.

24796. And it is possible for that subject to bring the teacher extra payment?—So I said—that Mr. Joyce acknowledged that that very subject was auxiliary to the other subjects he taught, as, for instance, the theory of mechanics.

24797. Is mechanics taught daily in the school at Marlborough-street, as part of the ordinary course?—I think mechanics is taught outside the hours.

24798. Have you not some navigation school in Dublin?—We have, at the central department.

24799. Is there not a school on the Quay?—No, it was contemplated to establish one at the Quays, but the site is at the model school.

24800. Has it ever been brought under your notice that the conduct of the examinations under the Science and Art Department is faulty and dishonest?—Yes, the teacher of the Clifton school was dismissed partly for having been accused of unfair play with the examination papers. One or two teachers in Belfast refused to avoid dismissal, and one teacher was dismissed from the Board's service for having falsified a return. He has been deprived of his certificate for three years, by the Department of Science and Art.

24801. Has there been any other case besides that?—There may be some other cases.

24802. Cases that you are aware of?—Not that I am cognizant of. I think everything depends upon the honesty of the Committee, and also upon their fitness for conducting such an examination.

24803. Was the case you referred to that of a teacher taking the questions out of the room, working them and bringing them back worked out to the candidate?—I never heard of such a case. I heard of cases not connected with schools of the Board in which there were even more considerable abuses.

24804. Did you think it part of your duty to bring that under the notice of the Science and Art Department in London?—I did communicate it to the Department of Science and Art, brought the subject under the notice of the Commissioners of National Education, and had the man dismissed absolutely.

24805. How did the cases of dishonesty which you mentioned come under your notice?—was it as Secretary to the National Board, or as a member of the Science and Art Committee, or from public report?—They came under my notice as Secretary to the National Board.

24806. Mentioned to you by an Inspector?—We had a communication from the Department of Science and Art on the subject.

24807. Was that asking you to investigate the matter for them?—No, they investigated themselves, and sent us the particulars in their report.

24808. After the investigation?—After the investigation. They sent us the details they came to and some of the leading heads; they did not give all the particulars.

24809. But in the cases where you knew of dishonesty and inferred them, of it—how did that come under your notice?—was it from public report or from your Inspectors?—I think it came from one of our Inspectors, and that I wrote to the Department of Science and Art. I think that was the way.

24810. Is there a general impression amongst teachers that the examinations are not fairly conducted?—No, I think there is not a general impression; but in some particular instances, I heard there was such an impression.

24811. Was the examination you have referred to held in Belfast, in the model school?—I think the

examination at which the unfair play took place occurred in the ordinary National school, not in the model school.

24812. It was not held in the model school?—I think not, it was held in a school the teacher conducted.

24813. Was the dishonesty chiefly in Belfast?—Yes, I mentioned the case of Clifton, county Galway.

24814. I think I understood from you that the smallest salary a man could receive from the Board was £15 a year? Now in the case of a teacher receiving £15 a year from you, would you forbid him to exercise any trade?—I should have said £10 a year. It is two-thirds of a probationer's salary, set down, the Commissioners' salary being £17.

24815. In such a case as that would a man be allowed to carry on a trade or keep a shop, or do anything of that kind?—The Commissioners would not interfere with him keeping a shop or exercising the occupation of a tradesman if he did not interfere with the business of keeping a school, unless the shop was a public-house. The Commissioners do not allow a teacher to keep a public-house.

24816. We have had cases mentioned to us where the teachers stated they paid the rent of the schools?—It is very generally done.

24817. Is that under the cognizance of the Board?—In every instance.

24818. Have you no rule which forbids such a system as that?—No, it's very much to be regretted that we have not such a rule. It is sometimes a hardship upon teachers. I remember a letter written, within the last twelve months, to a clergyman in Roscommon, pointing out the hardships, and stating that if he did not pay the rent, which was excessive, and which the teacher was unable to pay, the Commissioners would feel it their duty to strike off the school.

24819. Is it not sometimes the case that the school-room and dwelling are in one, and that it is represented a man is paying the rent of the school-house, when in fact he is paying the rent of his own house?—Yes; but he is paying the rent of both.

24820. The *Chapman*?—Is he paying more rent than he would pay for a common cottage, for his own occupation?—In some localities, if the accommodation was large, he paid more rent.

24821. Rev. Mr. Cooke?—Is there ever such a case as this, that a man himself gets a little money, builds a house, and uses it for a school, having got it recognised under the Commissioners as a National school, and then gets paid the rent for it?—I never heard of a case of that sort. If he built the house, he might make an arrangement with the manager to pay him the rent; but the rent must come from some local parties, for the Commissioners pay none.

24822. At the beginning of the system was there a condition imposed on the managers, that they should provide something towards the expenses of the school?—Yes.

24823. Do you require that now?—The Commissioners purport to require it.

24824. Do you enforce it?—Do you mean for the maintenance of the school, when once established?

24825. Yes?—We do not enforce it.

24826. So that in point of fact, the school is kept up at the expense of the teacher, and the Board in many cases?—In many cases it is, and from the fees, whatever they may be, paid by the pupils.

24827. Mr. *Shaker*?—Since the payment of the rent of a school by the master is not contrary to any rule of the Board, what ground have you for threatening to strike off the school when that system prevails?—The Commissioners can strike off any school which is not conducted according to their rules.

24828. But you have and there is nothing in the rules to prevent the payment of rent by schoolmasters. Can you say why you threatened to strike off the school in the county Roscommon, because the rent was paid by the master?—Because the rent was excessive. The master was in great poverty and unable to pay it, and the Commissioners proceeded to enforce their rule,

Feb. 17, 1866.

W. H. Sewell,  
Clerk, &c.

Feb. 17, 1896.

W. G. Smith,  
85, St. O.

requiring local parties to contribute to the support of the school. That was an extreme case, but they find it very difficult in impoverished districts to have all the requirements of their rules under this head, carried out. They would prefer dealing with such cases as leniently as possible.

24822. Mr. Deane.—What was the result in the case you had mentioned?—I don't know. I believe the clergyman has not replied to the letter. It is still *sub judice*, as it were. I think we have written three times. There is a difficulty in dealing with such a case, for if we strike the school off we deprive the teacher of the little he has.

24823. Was it from the teacher the complaint or representation on the subject came to the Board?—No, the representation came from the Inspector as a case calling for the intervention of the Commissioners.

24824. Did the teacher represent it to the Inspector?—He is obliged to do so, because the Inspector asks him the question.

24825. Rev. Mr. Coote.—What do you consider to be the lowest amount a teacher ought to receive from the State to be in a respectable position under the Board—what would you fix as a minimum?—The minimum I have set down from the State for a third-class teacher, having a school in the third grade, would be £35 for males, and £28 for females.

24826. Do you think that would satisfy the teachers?—I think it ought to satisfy the teachers as a minimum, but it is very hard to say what would satisfy any class of people.

24827. I have in my hand a return of small schools in the English county of Oxford, and I find that the lowest average for the salary of a teacher is from about £30 to £35. What would £35 in England be equivalent to in Ireland?—I suppose to about £30; but that is only for a third-class teacher.

24828. I am comparing it with the salary of a teacher in the very smallest schools in the diocese of Oxford?—But the means of local support there are very much better than in Ireland.

24829. The teachers who have been before us represented that £45 was the minimum that, in their opinion, would enable a man to live decently?—I would expect that they would be above any standard.

24830. They mentioned that a teacher had to keep up an appearance, and this required him to have more than persons who might be compared with him in social position?—I think it is very desirable that they should be elevated above the position of those they are in daily intercourse with. It seems respect.

24831. Lord Clarendon.—When you say £35, do you include anything on account of residence?—Nothing whatever. That is merely the State endowment. The teachers should have that supplemented by local support.

24832. Rev. Mr. Coote.—The local support appears to be in this case nothing of all, either in the way of fees or residence?—We know what it averages in Ireland. I think it averages about £6 a year for each teacher in Ireland. A third-class teacher would have about £40 on average.

24833. But might he not have to pay the rent of a school-house, and provide himself with a dwelling-house?—Yes.

24834. And provide for the repairs of the school-house?—He might.

24835. And provide the children with books and apparatus?—Not to provide the children with books and apparatus, because he would be paid for that. He is allowed a reduction of 25 per cent. on any books he may purchase, if the money is paid by himself, the managers declining to do it. The Commissioners having found that managers did not advance money to keep the school supplied with requisites, made a rule that if the teacher supplied them they would allow him 25 per cent. discount.

24836. I went into a school at Navan. It was in a very state of repair; very filthy. I had a conversation

with the teacher, and he said, when I asked him why the school was in that state, that he had to do all himself, and, as I understood, to provide books for the children?—That was misrepresentation, to a certain extent, because he is allowed discount for providing them.

24837. Are children bound to provide other materials—paper, pen, and ink?—They are. They get them at a reduced rate, exceedingly cheap. The books that are their own property they take home with them. Lastly, there are scarcely any others in the schools. The Board do not now supply books as free stock. They supply school apparatus of a more permanent character.

24838. Do they make grants of free stock now?—Only when they take a school into connexion; never after. The free stock used to be renewed every three years.

24839. Do they renew the free stock in the model schools?—We do, as may be required. The model schools being under the direct control of the Commissioners, they are the managers, and they perform the duties managers ought to perform in ordinary National schools.

24840. Mr. Stokes.—At whose cost are copy-books supplied to the ordinary National schools?—At the cost of the pupils.

24841. If the pupils neglect to supply copy-books so that the writing is not good, upon whom will the penalty fall?—The manager would be written to and admonished for not having kept the school supplied with requisites, but the penalty would certainly fall on the teacher for not having the pupils proficient in their penmanship.

24842. Is there not a certain obligation upon the teacher to provide copy-books for the children?—There is, so far as he wants to stand well with the Inspector. It is a hardship, but teachers labour under many hardships of that kind. These things reflect severely upon the managers who neglect to do their duty, and the teachers are to be pitied.

24843. Do you think it would be too much to expect from the country generally one-third of the amount contributed by the State?—I don't think it would be too much to expect, but I don't see how you are to get it, except by local raising.

24844. Do you know the number of children on the roll of schools in 1865?—The number was 213,000 in 1867.

24845. Take the average attendance at 216,000 for 1866, and calculate at a penny a week for each child, would that be too much on an average to expect from school fees?—Certainly not. That would give upwards of £56,000 per annum. I don't think a penny a week from each child as a school payment even from a labourer's child, would be too much if he had only one child, but if he had four children 4d. a week might be too much. I think four together might be admitted for 2d. a week.

24846. With an average of 216,000, and double that number in the class, it would give upwards of £120,000 per annum?—Yes, but a great many children don't pay anything.

24847. But do you think the managers should not be induced so to assist as to obtain each name and meet that amount of local support?—I think managers if possible should be compelled to contribute more largely towards supporting the schools than they do.

24848. Rev. Mr. Coote.—The main difficulty is to know how to compel them without making the poor suffer, is it not?—Yes.

24849. Mr. Stokes.—In compelling managers to contribute more towards the support of the schools, would it not be necessary to allow them to have a system of education they would approve of and not merely tolerate?—I think as a rule the managers throughout Ireland do approve of the system and not merely tolerate it. The parish priests throughout Ireland approve of the system very generally, and have often told

222-202

24850. Lord Clarendon.—Do you think where man-



ges do not subscribe properly for the support of a school there should be a local rate.—I think a local rate is very desirable. That seems to be a question that is occupying the minds of statesmen and the Legislature at present. I suppose we are gradually approaching it.

24856. Your opinion is favourable to it?—Yes, it would have this advantage, it would make persons in the locality to form a committee, and take some interest in the schools; and it would, of course, increase the stipend of the teacher.

24859. Mr. Deane.—Upon whom do you suggest the local rate should fall?—I think on the landlord principally.

24861. Rev. Mr. Gosse.—Do you contemplate with a local rating, extended local management, so that the money raised by a rate should be disposed of by a body selected from the rate-payers or should be disposed of by a Board in Dublin?—Well, if it is a local rate, the parties would be very jealous if they did not get the management of it to some extent.

24861. Is not that likely to lead to mismanagement?—I do not think it necessarily should. I would assume that a committee would be nominally supposed to look after the interests of the school, but it would be left in the hands of the clergy, either the parish priest, or rector, or the case might be, or the Presbyterian clergyman; for we find as a matter of fact that where there are committees, they hardly ever interfere.

24862. Is the Board responsible for every officer paid in model schools?—I think so.

24863. You mention two ways in which the Board becomes aware of the qualifications of candidates for these appointments. One would be through the Head Inspector, and the other from noticing the proficiency of the teachers when in the training schools?—That is through the professors.

24864. Now which of these two methods do you think the best?—They are very closely allied. Our professors are generally acquainted with the attainments of trained teachers; and they often refer to their notes to see if the statements made by the Head Inspector are correct. I have frequently myself, on receiving recommendations for appointments from Inspectors, consulted the professors, to see if they agreed.

24865. What would you consider the principal qualifications for appointments?—First, there must be adequate literary attainments.

24866. Would that come first?—Well, the three or four things I would mention and would regard as essential, you may put them in any order you wish: literary attainments, natural aptitude, and acquired fitness for teaching, personal appearance and address. These are the principal qualifications.

24867. Why do you want the latter qualification?—It is in order to attract the middle—the children of the middle class?—No, not to attract the middle class children. I think children of all classes are always attracted by the appearance of a teacher. I think it has a great effect upon them.

24868. Do you require any qualification as to personal appearance in the case of the master?—Well, I would be very much guided by the appearance of a master too, by his manner and demeanour.

24869. Are you aware that the majority of female teachers of model schools were appointed so early as twenty-three years of age?—Yes, I thought over that since yesterday.

24870. Why has the qualification of experience in teaching schools been set aside in that case?—I don't think it has been set aside. I think before a woman is twenty-three, she may have acquired very considerable experience in teaching, and she may have been teaching for twelve years.

24871. I have an instance in your return here of one mistress in an infant school, being appointed when she was seventeen?—Well, I think that is a rare case. That is the minimum age. The Commissioners would not be so particular as to age in selecting the teachers of infants, as they would in selecting teachers for girls. I don't know the case you refer to, but she may have

been a mistress at eleven years of age, and she may have been a teacher for six years.

24872. The case I refer to is that of the mistress of the infant school at Truro, who was appointed on the 1st June, '57.—M. E. Murphy. The age is twenty-nine?—She was appointed in 1857. I should look into the statements. She looks a good deal more than twenty-nine; she looks thirty-six.

24873. The head mistress at Athy school must have been appointed at sixteen.—Scotter.—That is not her maiden name. She is married. She was brought up as a mistress and pupil teacher at Marlboro'-street model school.

24874. In Corkinzie the head mistress of the female school, must have been appointed at nineteen, and I see the same in many other cases?—I would accept, with some hesitation, all these statements from these teachers on the question of age. I say that deliberately from the cases you have mentioned. If you kindly give me the names of these teachers, I will get from the returns in the office, the ages we have set down for them.

24875. I have quoted from your own returns?—She filled in that very likely herself.

24876. You have no means of correcting it?—We have, if we look to our books; because if a person enters the service at nineteen, she has no hesitation in admitting she is nineteen. But I know the case of a teacher present to my mind this minute, who has misrepresented her age every time. She is nearly the same age for many years past.

24877. Have there been any instances of the appointment of the daughters of Inspectors to posts in model schools?—I think there are two or three.

24878. There are two sisters named Clarke—one in Limerick and the other in Clonmel—are they daughters of an Inspector?—We have no Inspector named Clarke who ever had a daughter a teacher. The father of these girls was not an Inspector of National schools. Clarke, who was an Inspector, had two or three children who are dead—one little girl is alive. He has no connection with these schools. These teachers came from Clonmel. Their father, I think, was in trade there.

24879. Do you not think the tendency of having so many teachers as you have in model schools is to make many of them extremely idle?—I cannot admit our model schools, so far as teachers are concerned, are over staffed.

24880. Would you not consider one teacher to every eight or ten pupils too many?—That includes pupil-teachers and monitors.

24881. Can they be fully occupied where there are so few children?—Where the attendance is not sufficient to occupy their time there is a disposition to idle. I thought you referred to the principal and assistant teachers.

24882. Have you ever had complaints of the principal teachers neglecting their work altogether and leaving the work to be done by pupil-teachers and monitors?—Yes.

24883. Have such complaints been frequent?—No, the Inspector observing such a state of things would himself at once call the attention of the teacher to it, and we might not hear of it.

24884. Have you heard complaints of Ennistiffen school?—We received a representation some weeks since that the head mistress was haggard, and was not doing her duty.

24885. Did your Inspectors confirm that from his own observation?—It was from the Inspector we received the report. She is a person in delicate health.

24886. What would you do in a case like that?—Admonish her, and if she did not improve, remove her.

24887. Would it be for inattention?—If it were repeated she certainly would be removed. I don't mean she would be necessarily removed from the service, but removed from the school.

24888. Would it disqualify her from service under the Board if she could find another school and if the

Feb. 17, 1863.

W. H. Newell,  
esq., 11, N. 1.

Feb. 17, 1889.

W. H. Newell,  
Esq., J.B. 10.

properly conducted in?—Certainly not,—it would be for the manager of another school to say whether he would accept of her service. If we found she did not conduct the school efficiently, we would deal with the case accordingly.

24889. Have you ever heard complaints from the model school at Carnkingsburg?—I don't remember; we have complaints from several schools, for they cannot all go on smoothly.

24890. Is the tendency of having too many assistant teachers naturally to make the principal teachers take their work easily?—I don't think that would be the practical result. It may be with indolent natures, or with persons who are not conscientious, but I don't think that necessarily follows.

24891. Had the reduction of staff in model schools to which reference has been made any reference to such a state of things—to the fact that the staff was considered too numerous?—I think that motive was not entertained at the time.

24892. Lord Clonbrock.—You do not train persons at your training school till they become teachers?—As a rule they are not brought up to be trained at the central establishment till nominated to a National school or put in charge of one.

24893. Do you think that is a good system?—I think, if we were sufficiently advanced for it, it would be well to have the teachers trained before they take charge of the schools.

24894. They would be much more likely to find a school if they had certain qualifications, then they would be if untanned, as teachers?—They would be better qualified to carry on the school after being trained.

24895. And the managers would be much more likely to take them?—If they approved of the training.

24896. When you have educated persons up to a certain point, when they are qualified to be good teachers, are they not likely to take their talents and education to other pursuits, and may you not lose your supply of teachers in that way?—That has not occurred. We found that, when teachers are qualified for schools, and desirous of obtaining them, as a rule, they can obtain them. They seldom leave the position of school masters till they are some time in the Board's service, and have raised their qualifications. Then, if some opening presents itself, which would enable them to be more comfortable in life, they leave us.

24897. Do you find they leave the service after they have been in it for some time?—I think the year before last, 159 trained teachers left the service. Many of these possessed high qualifications.

24898. Had they schools?—They had schools, and were fairly provided for.

24899. That would tend to show that, as a class, they are underpaid?—I think it is one of those facts that establish it clearly.

24900. As a general rule, what occupations do they take to?—They get into miserable establishments as clerks. I have known some go into the police, both constabulary and metropolitan. They emigrate largely.

24901. What rank in the police?—As sub-constables. Their pay is better as sub-constables on an average than their pay as National teachers.

24902. Is a sub-constable's position a better one than that of a National school teacher under the Board?—Decidedly a better position; the pay is better than the average pay of all the teachers in Ireland.

24903. The Commission.—Do you think it undesirable, within reasonable limits, that the fact of having conducted a school successfully for some years under the National Board, should be an avenue to better employment elsewhere?—No, I don't think it undesirable, but I think it is a fact that proves that teachers—when the migration takes place to a certain extent—are not satisfied with their condition.

24904. Is it not desirable in many of the secular schools, that the school should be taught for a few years by a young person rather than by a person of

advanced years?—I don't see any advantage in a young person taking charge of a school rather than an old person.

24905. Is not a schoolmaster for a certain number of years liable to be deficient in energy in his work?—I think so, looking to the very old hands, but I should say that, from eighteen to fifty, a teacher has a good deal of work in him.

24906. Mr. Deane.—Are these teachers you mentioned as having left the service of the Board generally old?—No, not old; they are in the prime of life.

24907. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is the majority of them of a younger class?—I could not say. The return was not furnished to me in that way.

24908. Lord Clonbrock.—There are, I suppose, as many openings now in the way of clerkships and similar occupations, and persons well qualified for them can obtain salaries higher than the country can afford to give to schoolmasters, that it would be difficult to keep such persons in the service?—Well, there was always a certain number of teachers leaving our service in consequence of that fact. The clerks must be better paid as a class than the teachers, but there were the teachers dissatisfied to the same extent as they are now. No doubt those 159 teachers did not obtain clerkships—not 25 per cent. of them.

24909. Probably these teachers were amongst the elite of your body of teachers?—Many of them were amongst our first-class teachers.

24910. The Earl of Deserontoe.—Have you any idea what number of them went into the constabulary?—I have not, but I remember five or six cases myself, therefore, I said the constabulary was one of the employments that absorbed our teachers.

24911. Lord Clonbrock.—Have you ever heard of any of the teachers being accused of disloyal practices, and Fenian insinuations, and things of that sort?—I dare say the remark might be applied to a few teachers, but I can say that I think I am more thoroughly acquainted with the teachers of Ireland than any other officer of the Board, and I have devoted special attention to this subject. When the Phoenix company broke out some years ago, of which Fenianism was merely a movement in succession, I was sent to the south of Ireland to make inquiry confidentially of resident and local magistrates on the subject, and I satisfied myself that in very few instances, indeed, were the National teachers involved. There was a good deal of suspicion, but it was impossible to bring home any proof. I happened to know the teachers in that part of Ireland, for I had been Head Inspector there for five or six years, and I was satisfied that, even in the suspected cases, there was no ground. I made a report to that effect to the Commissioners. I know the teachers were under very great pressure from disloyal agents—American and native.

24912. It is a fact, I believe, that you never had an instance of a National schoolmaster being convicted of Fenianism?—In this way it would be true. I think there is no instance of a National teacher while in the service of the Board having been convicted of Fenianism, but I think there were some men who had been in the service of the Board, and who were subsequently convicted.

24913. There was one who had been removed some years before?—Yes.

24914. Mr. Deane.—Supporting the rate to be raised as you suggested just now, from the landlords, how would you propose that that fund should be disposed of?—There are two ways it might be disposed of. It might be disposed of by local committees or by the Central Board in proportion to the wants of the locality.

24915. Lord Clonbrock.—Ought it not mainly to that contribution towards the expenses of the school which the manager would be expected by the Board to supply if he did his duty?—Quite so.

24916. Mr. Deane.—Would it in your opinion be just, that one class alone of the community, the class of landowners, should be taxed for this purpose, when the management of the great majority of the

National schools in Ireland is for the greater part in the hands of another class?—Well, I think they are more responsible, because the people are often too poor to pay for the support of the teacher. I think the landlords of the country are bound, to some extent, to see that the education of the people under them is provided for, in a measure, at their cost.

24917 Do you contemplate that that rate should be raised from the owners of landed property exclusively, or that it should be raised as the poor-rates now are, and be payable share and share alike by the occupier and owner?—I think that would be a very good arrangement, share and share alike by the occupier and owner in fact.

24918 Do you think that having to subscribe something would tend in any degree to give to the tenantry class in the country, for whose use the schools are intended, a greater interest in the schools than they have now?—I think it would induce them to take a larger interest in the working of the schools.

24919 What machinery would you contemplate for the raising of such a rate as that?—would the districts from which the rates should be raised be coterminous with the unions or electoral divisions, or would you have a county rate?—I have not much considered the point, but knowing how those various collection managers to get in their money, I would say the readiest way would be a county rate.

24920 Would you have it collected as part and parcel of the county rate, or as an addendum to it?—As an addendum, to be disposed of by a local committee, or a Central Board.

24921 Would you consider that the fact of a rate being raised in this way would make any difference as regards the absolute power, if I may call it so, which the managers now have in their respective schools?—I think it would be a very dangerous thing to deprive the managers of the power of removing the teachers. I know it is subject to abuse in theory—practically it is not. I find that in Scotland where the teacher retains his situation of office and emolument, it is very difficult to remove him, so that I would not like to deprive the manager or the committee, if a committee were established, of that power.

24922 Rev. Mr. Cross—Are you aware that the teachers who came here to represent the grievances of their body, within that demand?—Yes, I know that pressure was put upon them to do so.

24923 Mr. Deane—Have you known any cases of special hardship having arisen in the dealings between managers and these teachers, anything that you would consider an unjust or arbitrary exercise of power on the part of managers?—Two or three cases in my whole experience. I don't now refer to their treating them badly nor contributing towards their support, but merely removing them from, perhaps, union to union.

24924 Have any cases ever come under your notice where managers have expected services from teachers, which they had no right to expect from them—menial services or anything of that kind?—Never, never a menial service, but they expect the teachers to assist them in their ministrations as clergyman, particularly the Catholic clergyman do largely, and the teachers generally do that, without any complaint. They have in some instances said it was very hard when they work all the week, and be obliged to go to the Catholic church on Sunday, and teach for two or three hours. I have heard them complain of that, but I don't know of any other instance.

24925 That is to teach catechism?—To give religious instruction.

24926 Are you aware of any representation having been made to your Board of any special case of hardship having occurred to a teacher in Kilkenny within the last two or three years?—I know teachers have been dismissed for coming up for training.

24927 I ask as to a special case from Kilkenny, the case of a woman named Lynch?—I don't remember the case, perhaps no representation was ever made to the Board about it.

24928 Have you known difficulties or differences of a serious character to have arisen between officers resident in model schools of such a nature as to call for the interference of the Board? Yes, several cases in which the Commissioners have had to order inquiries. Cases of complaints by assistants against the head master or by Inspectors against the head masters.

24929 Are these of frequent occurrence?—No.

24930 Has anything of that nature occurred in the Cork model school lately?—Yes, there was a serious case in the Cork model school. The head master was removed, but in consequence of previous good service he was not dismissed. He was appointed to a minor model school on probation.

24931 Were any other officers in that establishment dismissed at the same time?—They were dismissed from that institution, and they were transferred to minor schools.

24932 Have any complaints come before the Board of any specially bad feeling, or evict acts arising from such bad feeling, among the officers of the Denneway model schools within the last few months?—No.

24933 Mr. Stoker—What are the conditions of appointment of the model school teachers who are under the exclusive control of the Board?—That they should be qualified for their office.

24934 But on what terms do they hold the office?—At the will of the Commissioners.

24935 Since it is regarded as a grievance by the ordinary teachers throughout Ireland that they are dismissible without notice by the managers, do you not think it would be a good thing for the Board to set an example and to appoint teachers under agreements to give a reasonable notice on either side, say three months?—They always give one month's notice, unless in a case of immorality, and even in a case of immorality the Commissioners pay a month's salary in advance, and send the teacher away. They have the same practice in the model schools as in the ordinary schools.

24936 Is it not the case that any agreement would be vitiated at once by immorality, or any serious dereliction of duty, but that such agreements would hold good in ordinary cases, where persons merely desire to change?—I don't quite understand.

24937 Will you tell me again upon what terms the model school teachers hold their office?—It depends upon the will of the Commissioners.

24938 Did you not say they are liable to receive a month's notice?—Yes, they may give them a month's notice. It is the will of the Commissioners to give them a month's notice.

24939 What notice must they receive or give—one month?—They need not give any.

24940 Are the teachers free to leave the service of the Board any day they please without notice?—They are.

24941 Is that the case also with pupil teachers?—Yes.

24942 Do you not consider that a very improvident plan of dealing with pupil-teachers that the Board should spend a certain sum of money upon them preparing them to be teachers, and then let them free to go at any moment?—Unless you have them apprenticed under articles of agreement as in England, they may go where they like.

24943 Do you see any objection to apprenticing them?—No.

24944 Have you not had cases of persons who went off without notice to enter the Constabulary?—Yes.

24945 Is not that a loss which you might adopt means to check?—It is a very serious circumstance, but I don't see how we can adopt means to check it.

24946 The Chairmen—Will the Constabulary take a man who was a National teacher, without reference to the Inspector or some one connected with the system?—Yes, the man only requires a certificate of some respectable persons in the neighbourhood. I believe a magistrate and a clergyman must sign.

Feb. 17, 1863.

W. H. Nevill,  
Clerk. L. 2.

24947. *Mr. Stokes*.—Can you say, amongst model school teachers, how many cases there are of married women living apart from their husbands?—I cannot. I know one or two cases in the north. They were most exemplary women. Their husbands were the very worst possible characters.

24948. Is there not a case in Dublin?—I don't know.

24949. Do you consider it desirable that persons of that class should be presented as models for the young persons under them?—I think if it is not their fault, if it is the fault of their husbands who treated them badly, it would be hard to visit it on them. I know these women. I know two women at — The most exemplary women in the Board's service. They married two men who turned out very depraved. They were obliged, after the greatest possible forbearance, to live apart from their husbands. That was an accident, which I do not think reflects upon their character.

24950. Are there many cases of marriages between teachers of model schools?—Very few. I am surprised there are not a great many.

24951. Would you think it desirable, in a school where young persons of both sexes, from fourteen to seventeen years of age occupy contiguous rooms, and use a common outside, that the teachers should set a model of love making?—I am quite attached to that as a very rare occurrence. It is an abuse which ought to be checked at once, if it occurs. The surveillance exercised over these model schools is very rigid.

24952. There was formerly amongst the rules of the Board, a regulation to this effect:—"The Commissioners have provided a normal establishment in Marlborough-street, Dublin, for training teachers, and selecting persons who are intended to undertake the charge of schools; and they do not sanction the appointment of a teacher to any school unless he shall have been previously trained at a normal establishment, or shall have been pronounced duly qualified by the Inspector of the district in which the school is situated."—The Commissioners found it was impossible to supply teachers as fast as the schools increased. Many of the rules have been modified in the history of the Board, because the Commissioners had to adapt them to circumstances.

24953. *Lord Cloness*.—Why was that rule changed?—Because the schools increased faster than the supply of teachers. The rule lapsed into disuse.

24954. *Mr. Stokes*.—Was not the difficulty of providing trained teachers graded at the first institution of the Board?—They might have trained a number of teachers before they proceeded to establish any schools, and then established the schools according as they had the supply of teachers, but they found that system would not work. They were obliged to accept schools when applications were made to them. I apprehend that at first it was contemplated to build school-houses in every instance almost, and before they would be ready, teachers would be trained, but applications came pouring in from schools already in existence, and it was impossible not to recognise their claims. The applicants had teachers, and they were not trained.

24955. Under the system which has been in operation for thirty-five or thirty-six years, has the difficulty of providing trained teachers for schools grown greater or less?—Latterly it has increased, and as I said yesterday, I think it will continue to increase as long as the teachers are undisciplined. I repeat the statement I made yesterday, the faster you train the teachers, the quicker they will leave the service.

24956. The system has not worked in any way to increase the number of trained teachers, in comparison with the number of schools requiring teachers?—I think it is not so much that we did not train the number of teachers required, which, I admit, we did not, as that when they are trained, we do not adopt the means of keeping them in the service, by paying them adequately.

24957. *The Chairman*.—Do you consider that it is desirable that the teachers of common schools should attend model schools, in order to see how the model schools are carried on?—Very desirable.

24958. Do you do anything to encourage the teachers to attend?—Yes, the District Inspector suggests it to those in the neighbourhood of the model school, that they should go and see the school; and as a rule, the teachers in the neighbourhood of model schools, are pretty familiar with their working. When once familiar with them, they rarely go again.

24959. I believe they do not get any allowance to enable them to attend the schools?—No.

24960. Do they report themselves in any way to the superior of the model school when they come?—No.

24961. Are they taken any notice of by the teachers in the school?—The teachers in the model school have no instructions on the subject; but they generally treat them kindly. They have a fellow and kindly feeling towards them.

24962. Would it not be desirable, if this is really important, that the teachers, when they come to these schools should report themselves, and be taken notice of as teachers, and recognised as attending for instruction?—I do think an official recognition of that sort would be very judicious.

24963. Do you think a small allowance while living for a time in the neighbourhood of a model school to enable them to attend would be money thrown away?—I do not in the case of outworn teachers, if as teachers they went for a day or two, and were allowed the expense of locomotion and a certain sum per night.

24964. For what length of time?—A week in any case would I think enable them to see generally how the school was conducted. If you wanted to communicate knowledge of the methods of teaching they should remain longer, and then it would be better for them to come to the central department.

24965. Do you think that in any of the parishing schools of different sizes attached to the Marlborough street establishment, that with the different staffs of teachers they have they practically exemplify the ordinary common schools of the country?—I think they do practically exemplify what the ordinary schools ought to try to arrive at.

24966. With regard to the Inspectors, do you think the lowest class of Inspectors are sufficiently paid?—I think the District Inspectors lately are very fairly paid, and if there was some slight increase made in the allowance for locomotion, which would only cost £100 or £200 more to the Treasury, but which the Treasury is not disposed to give, I think there would be no complaint.

24967. Is the third class Inspector put on a different footing as regards the allowance for locomotion from that of the other ranks?—No, they all receive the same allowance. When they reach their masters, they receive £50 a year, attained by yearly instalments of £10, for personal allowances; and they receive 4s. for any school inspected four miles outside the centre, but they are not allowed to inspect more than two schools in a day. If the school is over twenty miles they receive 7s. and they may inspect the two schools. That would be 14s. The Inspector has to pay for the locomotion.

24968. Then at the present time does the lowest class Inspector get the same mileage allowance and so on for travelling as the first and second class Inspectors?—The three classes get the same. The difference is in the salary only. The salaries are, for first class District Inspectors £320 to £370, second class £215 to £295, third class, formerly called Sub-Inspectors, but I provided upon the Commissioners to change the name, as the duties were exactly the same, £200 to £320. Now the total cost of inspection in Ireland for 1862-63 was £215,440. Compared with England it is much cheaper. We have nearly the same number of Inspectors. In England the cost was £63,453. Our office in Ireland costs £16,944, while the office in London costs £22,573, so their machinery is very nearly double the cost of what ours is in Ireland.

24969. *Rev. Dr. Wilson*.—Is the difference in payment for inspection between the two countries owing principally to the higher salaries paid to the English Inspectors?—Principally, the English Inspectors are

Feb 17, 1889

W H Newell  
Esq., LL.D.

paid very much higher than our Inspectors are paid. I believe that they have a large area to go over.

24970. While the teachers have been complaining in this country of inadequate payment, contrasting their payment with the payments in England have the Inspectors here been complaining?—The Inspectors have made frequent complaints of inadequate payment, and their complaints have been generally responded to. There have been no complaints recently except from some individuals, but the body have not remonstrated, and I think relatively to the other employments under the Commissioners, they are now very fairly paid.

24971. The Chairman.—Do you think it desirable to diminish the number of Inspectors and raise their qualifications and allowances?—I think it would be quite inadvisable to diminish the number and quite unnecessary to raise their qualifications, for at present the examinations are very high for admission to the office of Inspector. The qualification is about as high as that for almost any other appointment under the Government, except for some Indian appointments; and the qualifications required for clerks in the Education Office is higher than that of any other office except the Colonial Office, under the Government. If you decrease the number of Inspectors of course you will also reduce the number of Inspectors in the year very considerably, which I think would be a mistake.

24972. Mr. Dene.—Do you consider the present number of Inspectors sufficient?—I think the present number of Inspectors quite sufficient to secure two inspections of the schools within the year, with frequent incidental visits. And I think the Commissioners should not continue to require three inspections in the year for the following reasons.—In the first place it taxes the Inspectors very much in trying to effect it. It is only attempting what cannot be done. At the next place, we leave our inspection now to any time that the Inspectors can visit the school. The consequence is that some of the inspections are made at times when there is a very small number of children in attendance, and you cannot really ascertain what is the state of the school, whereas if you had only two inspections to be made at times when the children are largely assembled, you would have effective inspections; and if an Inspector visited the school for the purpose of inspection and found there were only a few children, he should treat that as an incidental visit, and go on visiting schools during the season incidentally, and wait till the attendance became large. Now, of the 6,513 schools in operation in the year ending 31st of December, 1866, 4,253 received three inspections—that is about two-thirds only were visited three times; 1,649 were inspected twice, and 611 were inspected only once. My view is—and it is a view I propounded to the Commissioners in the year 1864 in my general report—that there should be two inspections with frequent incidental visits, and I have no doubt the Commissioners will adopt that scheme. Indeed, I think they would perhaps have adopted it last year, but they said we will wait for the inquiry of the Royal Commission.

24973. The Chairman.—If a system of payment by results were begun, what amount do you propose the third-class teacher should receive on fixed salary?—According to my scheme, he would be paid under two heads—he would be paid a personal salary, and a grade salary, according to the merits of his school. Now, the teacher receiving a personal salary on the third rank might, by his efficiency, obtain a grade school of the second rank, and, in very many instances, a teacher with personal salary of the second class would obtain grade payment in the first.

24974. Supposing that payment to be made under two heads—partly at a fixed salary, according to his class, and partly as in England, according to the number of children who attend, and passed properly, and so on. What would you propose should be the fixed salary for the third-class teachers?—£20 for males, and £18 for females.

24975. Do you think it would be desirable that

eventually that should be diminished, and the larger portion should, with due notice, be made to depend on the results?—I think not. I think it is very essential the personal salary should be maintained, at least at the amount I have specified, otherwise you will not secure a respectable class of men. Making the calculation as carefully as I could, so as to strike an average according to the scales I have suggested, I find the male teachers would receive from the State about £45 a year, on an average.

24976. With respect to that portion of Mr. Kavanagh's report on the Clonsilla model school, which was not published, was not that found not to be anywhere in the office?—It was found in the office some time ago, but upon inquiry, recently it was found that it was not in the office.

24977. Has any inquiry been made in the office as to how the office came to have possession of it?—I have been asking about the matter, and I am acquainted with the general facts of the case.

24978. Can you explain it?—I can tell everything about it so far as I am concerned myself and the gentlemen who got it from me. I forgot exactly how many months it is since Mr. Taylor, one of the first class clerks, came down to my office, and said—"There is a curious paper, sir, a report of Mr. Kavanagh's—an extract from a report of Mr. Kavanagh's upon the Clonsilla model school, which was not published." I think he said it was not published. I said—"I have not time to read it, I know what Mr. Kavanagh's opinions were then, and I know what they are now, and I don't care much to read it." Two or three times he said to me on different days that he came in to get letters signed, or one thing or another—"You don't appear to have read that report yet, sir." I said—"No, I have not time to read it." It lay on my desk, or on one of the tables in my room. Sometimes after, a gentleman, who holds a high position under the Board, was in my room, talking to me, as people constantly are. He saw the handwriting on the paper was Mr. Kavanagh's. He said—"Will you allow me to read this paper?" I said—"With pleasure." It was an old paper—about eighteen years old. It had been pulled down out of one of the pigeon holes when looking for documents to prepare the returns for the Royal Commission. It was pulled down, not with the object of looking for itself, but in pulling down papers to make out the vast body of statistics you called for. I said—"You can have the paper, with pleasure, but bring it back to me." That is all I know about the paper.

24979. Has it ever been brought back?—No, I understand the paper is here.

24980. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you aware it is in the possession of the Royal Commission?—I was told so. It did not come there with my knowledge, directly or indirectly.

24981. Had you anything to do with placing it in the hands of the Royal Commission?—Nothing whatever.

24982. The Chairman.—Who was the person who took it from your office?—The person was Mr. Sheridan, Head Inspector of National schools.

24983. Mr. Dene.—Did he state his object in wishing to get it?—No, not at all. I understood when he asked me the question, might he have it, that he wanted to read it. I have frequently lent any officer in his position a paper to read, if not a confidential paper, it was a paper of old date.

24984. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You said that you knew what Mr. Kavanagh's opinions were at the time of this report, you did not read the document?—I have never read the document, but I looked at it, and I saw across it the handwriting of the late Mr. Cross.

24985. What were Mr. Kavanagh's opinions then?—His opinions then were very strongly in favour of the model schools.

24986. The Chairman.—Was not a return made to this Commission, that that portion of the document was missing in the office?—I think not, until an inquiry was made, when it was ascertained it was here.

Feb. 17, 1862.

W. H. Stowell,  
Clerk, &c.

That was not a document asked for in the papers connected with Mr. Kavanagh, because I have a list here of the papers that were asked for by Mr. Kavanagh, and Mr. Kavanagh wrote a letter to the Commissioners, a very long letter, accusing us of withholding papers wilfully, which was entirely untrue.

24587. If you desire to regain possession of that document, Mr. Sheridan is the person who would be responsible to you for its safe return?—Yes, Mr. Sheridan is responsible to me for the safe return of that paper.

24588. Mr. Stokes.—Had that document reference to the Rensselaer Model school?—No, I understood it had reference to the General Model school.

24589. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are you not aware it had reference to the principle of model schools in general?—I heard the clerk say so.

24590. And that its object was to refute objections of the Roman Catholic bishops to them?—I have heard that since.

24591. You said you knew his opinions then and now. May I ask has he changed his opinions?—I think so.

24592. Mr. Stokes.—Did you ever compare the salary of the Resident Commissioner with the salaries paid in the Privy Council Department in London?—Yes, I have.

24593. Are you aware that the Resident Commissioner receives the same salary as the Assistant Secretaries in London?—Yes, I think £1600 each; but he has apartments, coach and carriages.

24594. Does it not follow from the small amount paid to your head office, that the grades below him must also receive a lower amount than the corresponding grades in England?—We have always felt that the sum the Resident Commissioner received, was rather a hindrance to our advancement as far as salary went.

24595. Rev. Mr. Conne.—Was there not a proposition at one time to raise the Resident Commissioner's salary?—Yes, I believe Mr. Macdonnell might have had his salary raised on more than one occasion, but he declined.

24596. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—With regard to the classification of Inspectors, do you approve of the present classification?—I think it is a good thing to have three classes.

24597. Have you not used all their duties are of an equally responsible character?—They are quite the same, so they are, in the Constabulary for instance, where there are two or three grades.

24598. Should you not think it better to have a minimum and a maximum salary for all, so to be given according to length of service?—Except for the terms first, best, second and third class, the result would be quite the same.

24599. What should you say ought to be the minimum salary?—I think the present minimum salary. So far we have no difficulty in getting good and eligible men for the office, who are quite prepared to go through the very trying ordeal of the examination.

24600. Should you not think it better to have a maximum salary attainable in ten or fifteen years, to give by annual increments of £10, and to stop if not deserved?—The present salaries do rise by annual increments, and the Commissioners may withhold them if they choose, so that principle is applied.

24601. I am aware of that. I put my question in connection with the abolition of the present mode of classification, I wish to have no salary, but the salary going from a certain minimum sum, to my £450.

24602. You think it desirable to preserve the classes?—I do.

24603. The Clerkship.—Is it possible to make all the Inspectors of exactly equal importance?—It is not possible to do so.

24604. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is the present salary regulated by the position of the Inspector?—No, except that the men who are longest in the service get the best salaries.

24605. Would not such a plan as I propose tend to

secure equality and efficiency in the service?—I do not think it would, and it is usual to have grades; in the army they have grades. In the same way we have different grades in the civil service.

25006. According to the present mode of classification, and taking into consideration the balancing of religious denominations, is not promotion very slow in the service?—I think promotion is about as quick in the service as in most of the other departments, as far as attaining to the first and second class. The best inspectors are the press. They are only six to the whole staff.

25007. Have you not had, for instance, an officer of one religious denomination rising much more rapidly to another class while an officer of another denomination remained in a lower class, he being equally efficient?—Yes, I think men should be promoted not according to religion but according to merit.

25008. In promotion from class to class is it your opinion religious denominations should be taken into account at all?—I think not at all.

25009. Only length of service and proficiency?—Yes.

25010. Should you regard it as a fair principle that the inspectors should be open to all persons wholly irrespective of religious differences?—Yes, I would have them open in the same way as the clerkships are open. The only limit in case of clerkships is that an equal number of Protestants and Roman Catholics compete.

25011. I wish your opinion, if you please, as to the extent of mixed education in Ireland generally?—Well, I don't think I could state it better than it is put forward in the Commissioners' report. There all the details are given, and the various ways in which the attendance of children of different denominations is mixed.

25012. Will you state it briefly?—I think as a rule the schools are attended in their respective localities by the children of all persuasions. I know there are some exceptions.

25013. As to the schools in the south and west of Ireland, what is your opinion with regard to the mixed element?—There, of course, the mixture is small because the Protestant element is very small. But then it is so to be borne in mind that one-third of the entire number of Protestants of the Established Church consists of minorities varying from three to ten and fifteen who could not possibly have a school for themselves. There, I think, partake freely of the education given in the schools under Roman Catholic patronage and managers.

25014. Is it your opinion these small minorities exist in the majority of National schools in the south and west?—I think wherever the minority are they avail themselves of the schools, for I have found in the mountains of Leitrim, and in the west of Galway or Mayo, and in other parts of the south-west one or two Protestant children amongst fifty or sixty Roman Catholics. I have known them to retire at the time of religious instruction and go home.

25015. Is it your opinion that a representative of the National schools of the country the Protestant minority of the poorer classes in the different parts of Ireland could receive a good education—is there provision made for them in Protestant schools under Protestant managers?—I think not.

25016. You have had considerable experience of the country, of the south and west as well as the north?—Yes, of the north and west very considerably, and a little of the south and east.

25017. Are there schools under Protestant managers and teachers in the different parishes of the south and west of Ireland for the instruction of the higher classes?—In very many places none—that is for the humble classes of Protestants.

25018. If it was stated on apparently good authority that in almost every parish in Ireland there is a Protestant school, from your knowledge and experience of the country what should you say?—I should say it was an over statement.

25019. Are you aware, for instance, whether it is the fact or not, that in the inspection district of Banrick, twenty miles by thirty, exclusive of the city, there

25026. but five such schools?—I am not aware of the number.

25029. Should you be surprised to hear such a statement?—I would not. We have returns annually from our Inspectors of the provision made for the poor outside National schools.

25031. What was the Commissioners' object in establishing model schools at first?—I stated yesterday there were two objects.—First, they regarded them as preliminary training establishments; and secondly, as examples of what the best National schools might be made.

25032. At first were the model schools generally approved of?—They were generally approved of at first.

25033. By whom?—By all classes and denominations.

25034. Do you mean to say that the Roman Catholic prelates at first supported and sanctioned these model schools?—I do. I know that applications for their erection were sanctioned by bishops. The following bishops gave their support at an early stage of the establishment of these schools.—Dr. McSherry, of Monaghan; Dr. Ryan, of Limerick—he was present with me at the opening of the model school in Limerick; Dr. Dooley, of Belfast; Dr. Murray, of Dublin, Dr. Hulse, of Downpatrick—he signed the application for the establishment of the model school at Newry. I have the names of persons who signed applications from time to time. These were asked for by the Royal Commission, and I made notes for my own information.

25035. How may change take place in the rules and regulations of the model schools?—None.

25036. How may change of feeling take place amongst their former supporters?—Very considerable. The Roman Catholic hierarchy are now all very severely opposed, and, of course, the subordinate clergy also.

25037. Are you aware, as Secretary of the Board, of the means adopted for forcing the withdrawal of the children?—Yes. They have taken very strong measures to try and prevent the children from attending, such as withholding the sacraments of the Church even from teachers. I know one model school in which the sacraments are withheld from the teachers, and they leave that diocese, and sometimes come to Dublin.

25038. How did you become acquainted with that?—The teachers told me so.

25039. Mr. Stokes.—Is there any case of an Inspector lying under the same interdiction to your knowledge?—I never heard of an Inspector.

25040. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you consider that the operation of the Roman Catholic prelates is a good ground for withholding support from these schools?—I don't think it a sufficient ground. The schools have not changed in their principle in the slightest degree. They were supported by Catholic prelates in former years. They are still largely supported by the Catholic laity. I think that if State aid is withdrawn from any scheme because a body of ecclesiastics—however eminent and exalted they may be, or to whatever Church they may belong—opposes it, legislation becomes fruitless.

25041. But are you aware it has been stated that, to a large extent, the children of the humber classes are withdrawn from these schools?—I have heard it so stated.

25042. Have you looked over the returns from these model schools?—I have.

25043. Is such a statement correct, that the children of the humber classes have been withdrawn?—Well, the Roman Catholic children have been largely withdrawn, but if you mean that the children of the humber classes do not attend—

25044. I speak generally. Are these schools well attended by the children of the humber classes?—I understand your question now. I think they are. I have a copy of a return made to the Royal Commission on this subject. The return is divided according

to the position and occupations of the parents of the children. I divide it into forty-eight different heads. I begin with agents and managers, and it includes apothecaries, artists, attorneys, auctioneers, and so on down to labourers—every social distinction I could well think of. I found that of the 3,478 children who attended model schools in the last quarter of 1897—I begin with the lowest class—1,909 were the children of labourers.

25045. Mr. Stokes.—Under what class did you return in that table the children of Inspectors?—Under the class Inspectors.

25046. Is there such a class in the table?—No, I find it is "Government employees."

25047. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Give me the attendance of the children of the next class above labourers?—Tradesmen, 3,165.

25048. Mr. Stokes.—What do you mean by tradesmen?—Well, in Ireland, it means carpenters, tailors, and shoemakers.

25049. Mechanics and artisans?—Yes, but "artisans" has a higher application very often.

25049. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—The next class?—Clerks, 554, farmers, 1,137.

25041. Do you make any distinction in the farming class?—No, small and large farmers are all put down together. Servants, 225.

25043. Any distinction in the class of servants?—No. Soldiers and pensioners, 314; police, 192.

25043. Rev. Mr. Cope.—Have you given us these figures from the number on the rolls?—From the number on the rolls that quarter—not the year.

25044. If the proportion of attendance is the same as in ordinary schools, may we take it that one-third of the numbers you have given were present?—Yes, that is true, in ordinary schools, but not in model schools.

25045. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Can you state what the average attendance in model schools is?—Half, but that would not affect the question.

25046. Rev. Mr. Corrie.—Will it not affect the absolute numbers, although it does not affect the comparison?—The numbers relatively will be the same. It will not make the return relatively different.

25047. Mr. Sullivan.—Are you quite sure it will not?—It will not necessarily follow.

25048. Would it not be likely that a greater proportion of the children of labourers would be on the roll, than in average attendance?—I think the children of labourers, shopkeepers, servants, and the humber classes, attend very regularly.

25049. As matter of fact, is not the attendance of the poorer classes always less than the attendance of those better able to send their children?—As a matter of fact, it is so in ordinary schools, but not in model schools.

25050. Have you anything more than surmise for that opinion?—I have remarked it, that the children of the poorer classes, who come to model schools, come to stay and to learn.

25051. Have you any statistical facts to bear that opinion upon?—I have not. It is a conclusion I have come to from observation.

25052. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do these children of the humber classes pay fees in model schools?—They do.

25053. Under these circumstances, is not their attendance likely to be far more regular than the attendance of children in the ordinary schools?—It is more regular, because many children in the ordinary schools do not pay anything.

25054. Mr. Sullivan.—Is there not a considerable number of children struck off the rolls quarterly, because of non-payment in model schools?—Yes, some are, because the children have to pay in advance.

25055. Is there not a rule that they can attend for a month without paying?—There is no rule to that effect recognised by the Board. That may be the practice of some teachers.

25056. The Chairman.—You stated at an earlier period this morning that that portion of Mr.

Feb. 17, 1899.  
W. H. Newell,  
esq., LL.D.

Feb. 17, 1868.

W. H. Stowell,  
esq., &c. &c.

Kavanagh's report on model schools which had not been printed was taken from your rooms lately?—Yes.

25067. Then will you look at your letter to our Secretaries of the 7th December, with reference to portion of Mr. Kavanagh's report, extending from page 13 to page 29 inclusive—"these missing pages we cannot find in this office, although we have had most diligent search made for them"?—Yes, I remember that, and it was afterwards that I remembered this paper. I did not know at that time that the paper referred to Chomel, and I at once said that "this must be the paper which you brought down, Mr. Taylor," and this was the paper that was taken away.

25068. The *End of Dissuade*—Do you remember the date?—No; I do not remember the date, but I dare say Mr. Taylor, one of our first class clerks, can remember the week.

25069. Mr. Gless.—With reference to teachers trained elsewhere than in our model schools, do you think it would be proper that they before taking charge of particular schools, when going from model schools not under our control, should have certificates of competency given by the Commissioners of Education?—or by some competent authority?—Well, I think if they submitted to examination it would. Whether they were trained by ourselves or not we were bound to give them a certificate of competency and the benefit of classification, because training is not essential to classification.

25070. Do you think that teachers trained elsewhere than under the National Board should be allowed to teach as classified teachers without certificates of competency?—Without examination?

25071. Without examination?—Of course not without examination; and a certificate of competency from the Commissioners' own servants.

25072. Yes?—I think not.

25073. No matter where they may be taught they ought to have certificates of competency of some authority?—Under the Board? I think so.

25074.—Of course the observations which I have put do not refer to our existing rules as to teachers in convent schools who are exceptional?—They are treated exceptionally. They are not subject to examination.

25075. Mr. Deane.—Allow me to ask you whether the interdiction you have referred to as having been issued by Roman Catholic bishops in the case of certain model schools, went to the extent of withholding the sacraments from the parents of Catholic children attending such schools?—From the teachers?

25076. Have such interdicts been issued in the case of all the model schools?—No, there are some model schools which are attended very well by the Roman Catholics.

25077. Are you aware that in the cases where such interdicts have not been issued there is a materially smaller attendance of Roman Catholics than where such strong measures have not yet been taken?—The attendance has considerably decreased. It went down to a certain point, and there it has generally remained for several years.

25078. Very much smaller?—Well, yes, I think in some places it has fallen down in consequence of the stringent measures that have been taken. They are pretty general throughout Ireland, and in all cases the attendance of the Roman Catholics has fallen away. Twenty, thirty, forty, and fifty per cent.

25079. Is there a much more marked decrease in attendance where there has been such an interdict pronounced by the bishops?—Yes, all the interdicts come from bishops.

25080. Mr. Stowell.—What explanation do you give as to the other documents that were asked for by the Royal Commissioners and moved for by Mr. Kavanagh, and as to which we got the same answer that they were missing, and one of which is also produced and printed in our appendix?—The best way is perhaps to answer your question in detail in reference to the various papers that Mr. Kavanagh moved for.

He moved for seven papers. He was supplied with six, but one was a wrong paper, and when we found that out on receiving this letter we sent a further paper to the Secretaries of the Royal Commission. It was a very natural mistake, for I fell into it myself. The last paper that he asked for was the "Answer of James W. Kavanagh, Esq., to Board's proposal to erect ordinary National schools without local aid in poor localities." The second is "Answer of James W. Kavanagh, Esq., to Board's proposal respecting payment of teachers' salaries, and suggestion of a modified capitation scheme."

25071. Was that sent in?—That has been sent.

25072. When?—Since Mr. Kavanagh wrote to say that he had not got the right paper. The paper we sent was a paper headed as you will see "Payment of teachers' salaries," and that having caught the clerk's eye, he said "I have got it," and he copied it and sent it. However, when we got Mr. Kavanagh's letter we sent the right one here, but not to him. The third was "Letter of James W. Kavanagh, Esq., suggesting Teachers' School Manual," that was sent. Fourth—"Letter of James W. Kavanagh, Esq., suggesting an Inspectors' Manual," that was sent. Fifth—"Report on Beaufort National school, with minutes and correspondence thereon," that was sent. Sixth—"Report on Denmark-street National school, with minutes and correspondence thereon," that was sent. The seventh was "Correspondence with James W. Kavanagh, Esq., relative to the proposed erection of model schools at Ennisconry," that was not sent, because it was not in the office; but Mr. Kavanagh himself got a copy of that on the 13th August, 1862; and it was when that copy was being made out, the paper was mislaid. It was copied by a gentleman named Clarke, who was not one of the staff of the office, and who was employed by the Secretary at that time, Mr. McCready, to copy it. We have never seen the paper since.

25073. Is that gentleman still in the employment of the Board?—He is not.

25074. He is not the same as the Mr. Clarke who has been employed as supernumerary clerk in connexion with the books?—That was the gentleman.

25075. He is not now in the employment of the Board?—He is not.

25076. Not in connexion with the books?—Not in any way.

25077. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—On what date did Mr. Kavanagh get that copy?—It was made out on the 13th of September, 1862. I said August before, that was a mistake.

25078. Mr. Stowell.—As a matter of fact was not that document handed about amongst the Inspectors—the document about the Ennisconry school?—I know nothing whatever about it.

25079. Are you quite sure that it never went down to Ennisconry and was in possession of the Inspectors there?—I have never heard of it.

25080. You are aware that it was well circulated throughout the country?—I am perfectly satisfied that I know nothing whatever about it.

25081. Or about any similar documents that were abstracted from the archives of the Board?—Nothing. I never heard anything about any document connected with the archives of the place except the one which his lordship informed me about to-day, which I was instrumental in handing myself to Mr. Sheridan.

25082. You never heard that Mr. Sheridan had that very letter about the Ennisconry school?—Never.

25083. I want to ask you just one or two questions about the returns asked by the Royal Commissioners. As to section 11, No. 5—"Number of reports of violations of the rules of the Board relating to religious instruction during each of the last ten years, with names of admissions and reprimands, of fines imposed, of depositions in classification, of denunciations, of withdrawal or suspension of salary, and of schools suspended or struck off through such violations." Was this return made out from the county books?—It was.

25084. Why was it not made out from the reports



of the Inspectors?—Because the county books show all the cases in which action was taken.

25085. Did you understand that this return was confined to cases where action was taken, or that it was to be a return of the total number, distinguishing those in which action was taken?—Well I understood that unless action was taken it could not be considered that it was a violation. That question was very carefully discussed. Something arose which prevented action being taken, and perhaps we received a letter next week from the Inspector in a particular case to say that the violation no longer existed, and that it was committed under a mistake; and we did not regard that as a violation and therefore we did not take action. It may have arisen from a mistake.

25086. Taking the number of cases in which there was action taken what proportion would they form of the number of cases actually reported by the Inspectors?—Except when changes of rules occurred—when a rule was recently changed—they would be nearly identical. If there was a change of rule which was not introduced for some time, then there would be a considerable difference.

25087. Would you say 20 per cent?—With reference to what?

25088. The proportion of those sent in upon which action was taken?—I think they would be very nearly identical with the cases in which action was taken if the rule was one a long time in existence.

25089. Then you are not prepared to say whether the proportion is 20 per cent?—I am not.

25090. What proportion would you say?—I say that they are very nearly identical. If the rule is a long established rule and there is no recent change such as in 1866, I say that the number of cases in which action was taken, and the number of cases reported would be very nearly identical, but in the case of a recent rule the proportion might be very considerable indeed.

25091. But does not this return include years in which recent changes of rules took place?—Yes, it does.

25092. Now, what is the proportion of the cases in which action was taken to those in which reports were sent in?—I could not say what the proportion was, for when the Inspector came round for the first time after this rule was promulgated in very many instances he found violations simply from ignorance of the rule and not understanding it, and he reported the fact; but he frequently set it right himself, and it did not require action; and when we found that it did not require action we did not consider it a violation.

25093. What is the relative proportion between those in which action was taken and those reported for the past two years?—My answer is I cannot tell you.

25094. Would it be correct to say that the number in five times as great as those in which action was taken?—I cannot say whether it was or not.

25095. Now I will refer you to section 14, paragraph 11, of the Returns asked from the National Board by this Commission—"Number of female teachers now in office, distinguishing the teachers of model schools who have been pupils in convent schools." How did you make that return out?—I am not sure exactly how it was made out. Perhaps it was made out by application to the convents themselves.

25096. Does it include only the convent schools under the National Board?—Certainly. It includes no convent schools but the convent schools under the National Board. We have no power to get returns from any other convent schools.

25097. Does not that refer to persons now in the employment of the Board?—"The number of female teachers now in office, distinguishing the teachers of model schools who have been pupils in convent schools."

25098. Why did you restrict it to convent schools under the Board only, and not extend it to convent schools outside the Board?—Because we conceived that this return referred only to convent schools under the Board, and we never attempted to get information from other schools outside the Board.

25099. This return refers to persons in office under the Board?—Educated in convent schools.

25100. Is there a word there about convent schools under the Board?—We consider that is what was meant. I thought that was what was meant, that it referred only to convent schools under the Board. We had not the power of getting information from other schools. We had no right to intrude ourselves upon schools in the West under the Right Rev. —

25101. Does the return refer to schools at all, but to persons in the employment of the Board?—Yes, it says, "Who have been pupils in convent schools," and you must take the two clauses together; and I certainly never thought that it meant to refer to persons educated in convent schools—not National convent schools.

25102. Is not the meaning of this return clearly that we wanted to know how many persons were trained as teachers outside the training institution of the Board itself?—I did not know that that was the meaning. I thought the object was to ascertain the number of the teachers that have been produced by the convent schools in connexion with the Board.

25103. And how did you interpret the word "teachers"?—It may be possible that I am wrong in that construction, and it may be possible that we sent out queries to the other schools, but I am almost certain that we did not. They would not have done that without my instructions.

25104. How did you interpret "teachers"?—Any person holding the office of teacher, principal, or assistant.

25105. Then you did not include either paid monitors or —?—No; the reason assigned for not including paid monitors was not given by me. The very introduction of the words "model schools," shows the irrelevancy of the explanation.

25106. Then this return, as it stands, is confined only to those principal and assistant teachers who have been educated in convent schools, which might happen at the time to be in connexion with the Board?—I am disposed to think so; but, however, it is an important question, and I shall ask about it, for perhaps some teacher may have set down the fact that they were trained in convent schools not in connexion with the Board.

25107. Mr. Stiles—If you were asked about the number of officers of the Board who were brought up in Westminster school, how would you proceed?—I would simply ascertain at Westminster school how many had been brought up there.

25108. Would you have asked the officers of the Board, or have gone to Westminster school?—I think I would have gone to Westminster school, because the heads of the school would supply the information much easier. I suppose they keep a record of what becomes of their pupils. By "officers of the Board," I understand you to refer to every person in the service of the Commissioners at any time.

25109. Mr. Stiles—In your former evidence, at questions 2426 and 2427, I find this (2426) "The Chiefs of Inspection—are their duties laborious?" They are, very. (2427) State them?—Every report that comes in from every part of Ireland is supposed to pass through their hands; and though they may not read them all, every report requiring action has to be read. The reports are brought before them, and those which have been marked "nil" by the clerks, which signifies no action required, are not read. They merely initial them. Is that the meaning of the word "nil"?—The word "nil" means that there is nothing in the report requiring action.

25110. Then that is an incorrect statement of the case here that nil signifies no action required?—That is correct.

25111. Then in other places you give a different meaning to it. Here is your meaning elsewhere, which is totally distinct. In answer to question 2497, you say, "The clerk never recommends that the teacher should be fined." I go on to ask you. (2498.) In no case? and you reply, "In no case." He merely

Feb. 27, 1886,

W. H. Stowell,  
Q. 1119.

Feb. 17, 1890.  
W. H. Newell,  
Esq., Dublin.

notes the information, the antecedents of that teacher, the history of that teacher, if unfavourable. If favourable he says, "all—nothing against him." Then in one case it means that nothing previously has been registered against him, but it does not mean that there is to be no action taken in that particular case!—Allow me to look at the passage [Record of the witness's previous evidence of question 2427 and 2498 handed to him]. I do not see any contradiction; but as you seem to think there is, I think it is due to me to allow me to explain.

25112 Explain that!—In the first case, it is a general statement that every report that comes in from every part of Ireland is supposed to pass through their hands, and though they may not read them all, every report requiring action has to be read. The reports are brought before them, and those which are marked off by the clerk, which signifies no action required, are not read.

25113 Then, in the second case, you must take your question in connection with the former one—"In most cases it is the clerk who recommends that the teacher should be fined?"—Never. The clerk never recommends that the teacher should be fined.

25114 In no case!—In no case. He merely notes the information, the antecedents of the teacher, his history, if unfavourable. If favourable, he says, "all." That is, he says "all" with reference to his antecedents—that there is nothing against him, but he does not mean to say that there is no notice to be taken of what is in the report.

25115 You stated, in the first answer that all meant no action required!—When all is written on the report, and there is nothing else written with it, it means no action required; but when it is referred to the antecedents of that teacher it means that there is nothing against that teacher.

25116 Then it has two meanings!—It will have a thousand meanings according to what you apply it to.

25117 Then you adhere to the fact that "all" has distinct meanings!—It has different meanings in these places. In one place there is simply the word "all" on the report, without any other note whatever. That means that that report requires no action. Then with reference to a teacher or to the condition of a house, the clerk finds certain irregularities, and he notes them down, but he says, in the former report, there was all on these subjects.

25118 Then it is not that exactly the question I ask—has all two distinct meanings!—It has two distinct applications.

25119 In the same answer at 2437, in describing the duties of the Chief of Inspection, you say that there are many letters of a special character which have to be written, and which are often more troublesome than formal reports. Then there is the consideration of applications for aid, and "preparing them for the sub-committee." Now, are not these applications for aid determined by the clerks according to fixed rules previously?—They are never determined by the clerks. The information to enable the Committee to determine them is supplied by the clerks.

25120 What does the Chief of Inspection do!—The Chief of Inspection looks over all the conditions that are set down in the report, to see if the school is entitled, according to them, to aid or not. He looks first down the list and he sees the date of the application, because that will determine the date from which aid will be granted; and he looks at the statement as to the condition of the house and the number of children in attendance, and all those conditions, the fulfilment of which is required to entitle a school to aid; he must do that in every case, then he marks in a column of the report "grant," or "reject;" and then the Secretary, to check his inspection of the papers, remarks it, sees that it is right, reports to the Resident Commissioner that it is so, and, these being no difference of opinion, the case is so disposed of.

25121 At page 116, answer 2411, you say, "I require that the clerks in the departments who deal with the public shall fill up a bill of work under a variety

of heads, showing what the arrears are, whether under letters or under reports; and if I see that the clerk is unduly in arrears I bring him before the Board. I have had a clerk suspended for a month for arrears, that is a heavy penalty, I have had clerks fined for arrears. I see from week to week the condition of the office. I verify that by going up myself and seeing the clerks. I require the clerks to be open—no locks and keys—so that I can see what each man has to do." Has any case occurred in which a clerk was fined for having an undue accumulation of documents in his desk, recently?—I am not sure. That would not be the reason. He would be fined for having an arrears of business from which, of course, that accumulation would result.

25122 Recently?—Not very recently; not since I was here before.

25123 In recent times of the Board—say a year!—Yes, I think so; a year and a half or something of that kind.

25124 On that particular occasion was there any other instance in which an arrears was noticed?—I cannot say. If you tell me the occasion I can get the bill of work and show you all the arrears. All such documents are (as a general rule) preserved.

25125 I shall specify, before you leave, the month!—If I have the bill of work, you shall have it with pleasure.

25126 Do you recollect looking into the desk of a gentleman, with no less than 1,500 documents in his desk?—No, I don't. I do not often look into desks, it is regarded as a sort of espionage. But I gave them to understand that their desks were liable to inspection. Lately I have not looked into their desks at all, because I found, as a general rule, that they observed the directions, which they had received.

25127 That case could not have occurred!—Not with me certainly. I have not looked into their desks three times in my whole life.

25128 Was that one of the times?—No, certainly not.

25129 The Secretary, I think, has the power to get a clerk punished, or fined, or dismissed, without any offence being charged or alleged!—No, of course not, but he brings the case before the Board, and the Commissioners do it.

25130 In no case could that have occurred?—In every case the clerk is fined on the facts of the case by the Board.

25131 It always goes before the Board!—It always goes before the Board.

25132 And the Board have the case read!—The Secretary always reads it to the Board, unless it is an ordinary case of a fine for late attendance, for which there is a rule.

25133 There is an exception then in regard to fines for attendance!—The attendance book is always brought up and laid on the table, with a return of the clerks that attend irregularly; and I say, "Here are the reports of the clerks' attendance for the week, it happens to be very regular this week," or "it has been irregular during a few days, and there is the return," and the fines are imposed.

25134 Did you ever know of a Commissioner looking at it?—Yes, I have.

25135 Very frequently!—Very seldom; it is a matter of routine.

25136 What is the fine for one day's absence!—A day's pay.

25137 What is the fine for two days' absence!—Two days' pay, I think, and it may be a week, if the clerk cannot give a satisfactory explanation. If he gives anything at all like a satisfactory explanation, he is not fined at all. The system of fines has had a most wholesome effect in making the clerks attend regularly.

25138 Within the last eight months, how many fines have been indicated?—I cannot tell. Three or four perhaps every week, of sixpence each.

25139 But fines of £20, and another of £20, and another of £21—I think I had two or three clerks fined since I became Secretary, for gross irregularity.

and I had one dismissed from the 51st of last month, and restored, on condition that he should behave himself in future.

25140. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Was this system introduced by you?—It was recommended by me. I found that it was absolutely necessary for the discipline of the office. I know that there are many gentlemen in the office who would be glad to have the system cancelled.

25141. Mr. Shawcross.—Would you please to state what it was that each of those three fines was levied for—those large sums?—I cannot tell the particulars, but it was for repeated irregularities of conduct, arrears of business, and neglect of duty. The particulars are all set down in the Board's orders, and they can be furnished if you will only move for them. I recollect the gentlemen who were fined. I recollect their names, and I know their antecedents, and I know their names. I know that some of them have since become entirely reformed; and I know that another of them, at least one, was until a very recent period, almost or reckoned as even, and that was the reason he was dismissed.

25142. Can you account for the singular fact that all the clerks, whose fines are extremely low, in this particular case, are Protestants?—No, indeed, I cannot.

25143. And in the other case the fine is put against—?—That is not the case, because out of those fined a month's salary is a Protestant.

25144. Yes, Mr. —?—Precisely.

25145. In the case of Mr. — what was the cause?—Mr. — was fined for irregularity of conduct—not for arrears of business.

25146. What was the number of days' absence that he was fined for?—I forget how many. All that is set down in the minutes of the Board, and those cases are all brought before the Commissioners specially in the programme.

25147. I shall defer this portion of the examination till we get the bills of work. At question 3008 you were asked—“Have the Board represented to the Post Office the desirability of giving them special facilities for expediting the quarterly payments?”—and you replied, “Last year, when the thing came under my notice, specially as Secretary, I had representations made to the Post Office, and they sent out as increased number of sheets—a larger number than they used to do—but they said they could not go further.”

25148. Now, as a matter of fact, was the representation made when that statement was made?—As a matter of fact it was.

25149. Was the representation made before this Royal Commission sat?—It was certainly, but not the last representation. There was another representation made, increasing the sheets from fifty to sixty, by the noble Chairman. I believe it was by him it was done; I know that the Post Office authorities told us it was done, and his lordship told me that he would take an opportunity of doing something of the sort; and it was in consequence of his representation, I believe, that it was done; but I refer to a former increase of sheets.

25150. Would you furnish in your evidence the date at which that representation was made?—I could not possibly do so. I think it occurred in a conversation with one of the clerks of the cash office.

25151. Then no official representation was made?—No; it was a message that was sent across to the office, to know if they could do any more for us, as we were pressed for time. We frequently do that with the Post Office.

25152. Then, there is a good deal of business of a serious kind done by the officers of the Board without any official correspondence?—I do not think you are to draw a general conclusion like that from so isolated cases.

25153. At page 116, question 2811, you say that you have had a clerk suspended for a month for arrears. In that case what was the number of papers in arrears?—I do not know. They might have been

very numerous or they might not; but the same clerk had been in arrears fifty times before.

25154. What would you call a large number in a case?—Perhaps fifty letters; sometimes twenty. It would depend on the pressure of work.

25155. Is that an extraordinary number?—For one clerk to have in arrears?

25156. Yes?—Yes, it is a considerable number; but I have known the same clerk to have 300 in arrears, and to repeat it constantly; and I am only surprised that he was retained in the service of the Board the length of time he was. He would not have been retained in the service of any other Board in the Empire, I believe.

25157. Can you judge always by counting the number of papers of the amount of business that is done?—Yes, I can, because the bill of work is divided into sections, showing the nature of the papers that are to be dealt with, and then the items are set down, 6, 7, 10, 12, and so on, and then the total is the number of those papers.

25158. As a matter of fact, would not sometimes three or four papers occupy as much time as fifty or sixty of another kind?—Certainly; but that would not excuse the arrears.

25159. And do you take that into account?—I generally do; I do not know whether I did so on that occasion.

25160. You do not do so invariably?—I do not say that I look into it as a rule, but I would sometimes look into it. But if I saw that number of papers in arrears I would say that the clerk was very culpable.

25161. If a gentleman was in arrears to the extent of 1,000 papers, and that he happened to be a Protestant, would it make any difference with you?—Not the slightest; neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic. They are all the same to me as clerks.

25162. It did not influence you in the case of Mr. —?—Certainly not, not in the case of anyone else.

25163. What would you say if you saw 1,400 or 1,500 papers in his desk?—I never saw what was in his desk in my life. The papers might be very voluminous. One case might contain five or six hundred sheets, but the clerk would only have to deal with one document, and all the others might be put together as belonging to the case.

25164. At page 110, question 2466, you are asked—“Are your annual reports uniform, or are there different editions of them?” and you say, “I never heard of a second edition of the reports; I do not believe such a thing exists.” Was there a second edition of the report published in 1863?—I do not remember; I never heard; there may have been; but I was not aware of it.

25165. In that report is there not a second edition of the appendix?—I do not know.

25166. You are not aware of its existence at all?—I am aware of the existence of the report, but I am not aware of the second edition.

25167. Who orders the second edition?—It would, of course, be ordered by the Commissioners, or the Secretaries, and only by the Secretaries on communicating with the Board.

25168. Then could such a thing happen without the knowledge of the Secretaries?—I was not Secretary in 1863.

25169. Has it ever been complained of that the official programme does not fulfil the object for which it was intended?—By whom?

25170. By anyone?—I do not remember any such case.

25171. Has there ever been a protest against matters of importance being brought before the Board without being mentioned in the programme?—Yes, but that was not the question that you put to me.

25172. It is the same question?—I beg your pardon, you asked me if there was any complaint that the matters put on the programme had not been sufficiently detailed, and I said I never heard of it.

Feb 17, 1883.

W. H. Stowell,  
Clerk, &c., &c.

Feb. 17, 1869.  
W. H. Stowell,  
esq., G.D.

The point is now that they were not put on the programme at all.

25173 Has it ever been objected that the Secretaries misdescribed subjects and concealed their nature?—Never to my knowledge.

25174 Do you know anything of a round-robin of the Head Inspectors, which is in evidence here—how is that described on the programme?—I do not remember.

(Joint letter of the Head Inspectors handed to witness.)

25175. You do not recollect how that was described on the programme?—I do not remember.

25176. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Can you certify that you ever saw the programme in that case—did you ever see the programme?—Never, I was in the country at the time.

25177 Mrs. Sullivan.—If it were described on the programme as an application of the Head Inspectors for an increase of salary, would it be a correct one?—Well, as I remember the document, it would be only a partial description.

25178. Are there not a great number of very important matters touched upon in it?—There are.

25179. Then from such a description as I say, if it were on the programme would it be incorrect?—I think it would be a very imperfect description.

25180. Are the subjects upon the programme taken up always in the order in which they are upon it?—As a rule, they are. That rule is not departed from unless the subject first in order might have a very important subject, and the number of Commissioners assembled at the time might be small. Then I might say, "shall I go on to the second, or third, or fourth head, which is not important or is a minor matter, and wait till Commissioner So and So comes?" and then the Commissioners might say, "Better wait, as it is a matter of importance."

25181. Cannot the details of the business brought forward be so disposed of that the habits of attendance, and the system of the year at which certain members of the Board can attend, be taken into account?—I suppose if the Secretaries were dishonest men they could do so.

25182. Have you never heard it objected that things of that kind were done?—Never; I never could contemplate anything so base.

25183. You were one of the persons signed this memorandum?—Yes; I was one of the persons.

25184. What action did the Board take with regard to those who signed?—In my case?

25185. Yes?—They took the same action with all; they admonished us all.

25186. Were you not suspended?—Never.

25187. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Who were the others who signed it?—All the Head Inspectors at that time, I think, signed it.

25188. Do you recollect their names?—Mr. Keenan, Mr. Kavanagh, Dr. Pottam, Mr. Shahan, and myself.

25189. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you recollect the Killybegs appeal case, in the county of Limerick, visited by you in 1864?—I do.

25190. Anything out of this case did you make a complaint against the District Inspector?—I did.

25191. What punishment was inflicted on him?—I think he was fined £5.

25192. Was it not a leading ground of that complaint that he violated a rule or an instruction of the office, which obliged the Inspector to visit an applicant case, within three weeks from the date on which it was advised to him?—I think I stated that; and there was a rule at that time, or instruction to that effect, but that was not the reason he was fined.

25193. Did the Inspector appeal for a reconsideration of the case, and deny the existence of any such rule or instruction, and challenge you to produce it?—Yes, I think he did.

25194. Did the Board ever decide upon, or answer the Inspector's letter?—The matter has been brought frequently (before I became Secretary) before the resident Commissioners, and I think before the Board

also. That gentlemen was continually getting into scraps and difficulties, but he has left the service.

25195. Can you now produce an official copy of any such rule or instruction?—I am not sure that I can.

25196. Have you ever seen it?—Not since.

25197. Did any such rule ever exist?—I was strongly under the impression that such a rule did exist, and may still, and I have said so frequently at the office; it was not a rule in the meaning of one of the Commissioners' Rules; it was an instruction by circular.

25198. Did you appeal to have that portion of your report cancelled, when you found that you were in error?—No, because I found that that Inspector had neglected his duty on that occasion, in various ways, and I did not think that I was in error, and I did not think that he was an Inspector that required or deserved any consideration.

25199. Was not the punishment then inflicted referred to by the Board as a justification of the Board's subsequent censure upon that officer?—I am not aware of that. He exposed himself to so many censures of censure, that I do not think that was necessary.

25200. But if a Head Inspector, or more, if the Secretary, has the power to register a censure where there is no foundation for it, and that it remains on the books of the Board for a number of years without any answer or any decision being come to beyond the fact that he was fined, cannot that be brought up against him on all future occasions?—All these things were done before I became Secretary, so that I never registered a case. I was a Head Inspector at the time.

25201. Did the complaint originate with you?—The complaint originated with me that he had neglected his duty in not reporting on the case.

25202. May I ask you again to say whether the fact is not as I put it, that the main feature of the case is, that rule or regulation which is alleged to have existed?—I am really not sure of all the circumstances of the case, but I know that it was regarded as a leading feature in the case.

25203. And has not the same thing occurred with regard to clerks in the office, where the Secretary, who has a considerable amount of power in inflicting fines, registers the infraction of them?—He has no power to inflict fines; it is only the Commissioners who can inflict fines.

25204. Can he not inflict fines for non-attendance?—He cannot inflict fines for non-attendance. The case must go before the Board, there is an established rule that if a clerk is so many minutes late, he is to be fined. If he is late, the fine follows.

25205. The *Châsseuse*.—Is not that rule very commonly observed in large public companies?—I understand it is. Before I had any of those rules sanctioned by the Board I visited some of the leading public offices in this city to know what was the practice—the Post Office, the Board of Works, and the Poor Law Board, and I ascertained what was the practice there, and I saw how far we could apply similar rules in our own establishment.

25206. Mr. Sullivan.—Concerning the manner in which these matters are brought before the Board, and that the Commissioners never read them or refer to them, of which we have evidence in the returns of the Board itself, does not the power really rest in the hands of the Secretaries?—I think not all, because if the Secretary brought a case before the Board that was not a bona fide case he would expose himself to fine and censure. I know I should feel that.

25207. If a clerk appealed in the case of a late fine of ten shillings, and they refused to re-open the case, would it?—The case was put on the programme, and was brought formally before the Board by me—that is the case of Mr. — who was fined ten shillings for subordinate conduct, and most indubitable conduct in my own presence, he wanted to have that fine remitted, the matter came before the Board, I opposed it, and the Commissioners did not remit it; and very properly, I thought he would have been fined five pounds instead of ten shillings.

[The room was cleared, and on re-admission, the examination was resumed as follows.—]

25203. Mr. Shelton.—How many letters are sent through the correspondence office annually?—Do you pass through the correspondence office proper. That came in, at 14.

25204. Yes.—I should say from 10,000 to 12,000 a year.

25210. What proportion of these would go to the registry and salary office?—Any not sent to the Secretaries would be sent to the registry office. The proportion would be very large.

25211. What per-centage of them is referable to inspection business?—Most of them refer to business arising out of inspection.

25212. I refer specially to inspection business?—None refer specially and exclusively to inspection business, unless there happened to be a complaint against an Inspector or a letter from some one requiring an Inspector to visit.

25213. How many would be opened annually in the inspection office?—Is it including reports and letters?

25214. Yes.—The letters from the Inspectors amount to about 400 weekly—the reports received from the Inspectors average over 600 weekly. That would make over 1,000 weekly, or over 52,000 a year.

25215. What per-centage of these go to the registry and salary office?—All upon which action is taken, which action must be noted in the county books, or which have reference to the salary books, would be sent to the registry office.

25216. What would you say would be the possession of the whole number?—Fully one-half.

25217. Is there a classification?—There is a classification sheet for each—one for males and one for females.

25218. All papers referring to training classes go to the Registry Department?—All papers referring to salaries and salaries, go to the Registry Department.

25219. The clerks in the Registry Office also have a good deal to do with two classes of papers?—They have, and with many classes.

25220. They also prepare the statistical returns?—They assist in the preparation of them.

25221. That work is very various—the preparation of the statistical returns?—It does not take them much time. They have only to prepare a few papers. There are several clerks in the department; and they generally get the assistance of a clerk from me, or two, if they are pressed; but the work they have to do for the Statistical Returns they could prepare in a week or ten days.

25222. Suppose Mr. McCreedy's plan, which I asked some questions about on the last occasion, were adopted about the work of the salary and the registry office?—At the time you mentioned the plan I told you I did not thoroughly understand it. I thought the Commission had disposed of it, and I did not look at it since. I do not understand this plan.

25223. Would not the writing of the letters be the principal duty?—It would be one of them.

25224. They would have to attend to everything arising out of instruction, salaries, and also taking action. Every man would have then duty to take all the action required from the time the letter entered the office until it left?—Yes.

25225. Would not the Long Book in the salary and Registry Office be altogether abolished?—It was proposed to abolish the Long Book, which is a great convenience. It is a very ready book of reference.

25226. Are not great delays caused by clerks in one office having to search for papers in the other?—Literally a great deal. There has been much confusion owing to the mass of returns the Commission has called for. It has upset our establishment altogether.

25227. Would not these delays be avoided altogether on Mr. McCreedy's plan?—I could not say that they would.

25228. Would not the salary and registry office clerks be placed in a better position with respect to

the schools under his charge?—But the registry clerks are now perfectly acquainted with the schools under their charge.

25229. They don't know anything of the correspondence regarding the schools on the present plan?—They should know everything, for the correspondence is rounded.

25230. That is recorded for handing to the persons in every other office?—It is handed to him every morning by the clerk who distributes the papers.

25231. Mr. McCreedy's plan, if I understand rightly, abolished the counties?—I believe the basis of it was so far, to group the schools by districts.

25232. In some of the present districts there are four counties more or less, I dare say. I looked at district 19, and it struck me that takes in four counties?—Yes; three or four.

25233. Suppose on the 1st of January that a report comes in to the office, it would be opened in the Inspection office?—Yes.

25234. Received in the office on the 1st of January it would be checked in the office by the clerk for each county?—It would be checked by the clerk for each of the districts from which it comes, and he would know the district from which it comes, for the district would be marked outside.

25235. In that report there would be schools belonging to four distinct counties—in the report coming in, say the Inspector's annual report for particular districts—for example, district 19?—The annual report.

25236. Yes. That would have to pass through four hands, would it not?—The annual report would not go down to the Registry Office at all—it has nothing to say to it.

25237. Suppose that the Inspector sent up a bundle of reports on individual schools, what would be the course to be followed in that district 19?—The clerk in the inspection office would deal with them, read them over, and note them.

25238. One clerk?—One clerk. The registry clerks would then note previous action. Then the documents would go up to the Chief of Inspection for his examination, and when he had noted the action that was to be taken, that action would be communicated from the inspection office, the documents would be sent to the registry office. The clerk in the registry office would distribute them amongst the clerks of the various counties. He knows at once the county, and he knows the clerk to give them to.

25239. What number of days would it take to do that?—It would not take half an hour to distribute them.

25240. Before the whole thing could be done in the case of four counties would six days have gone over?—I think not. Do you mean before the distribution?

25241. Before the whole distribution?—Not unless they went away.

25242. As a matter of fact, am I right in supposing that is the usual time?—I think not. I don't think you are.

25243. What would be the average time that districts comprising four counties would be distributed?—If the papers came down with regularity, they ought to be distributed in the course of the day. The clerk may not dispose of them all in one day, but the objection to the district basis is this, the districts are frequently altered. If the Board increases the number of Inspectors, it will have to cancel the old arrangement of districts. The county basis is a permanent one, and is the only one on which the business can be conducted.

25244. Would this case be correct which I have made out from a case of the firing of a teacher—for this is the test of the two systems—the Inspector recommends a fine, the letter goes to the inspection office, the clerk of inspection office writes, "Chief of Inspection, fine recommended," the document passes to registry and salary office, the clerk notes, whether previously fined, or reprimanded, or admonished on a similar charge, and how often, then it is sent with

Feb. 27, 1902.

W. H. Newell,  
Esq., M.D.

this noting to the Chief of Inspection?—Yes, but this process may not occupy more than a day or two.

25245. In a month's time the salary becomes due, and it is stopped, the clerk having noted that a fine has been recommended, when noted by Chief of Inspection, who anticipates the Board's order, by writing upon it before it goes to the sub-committee, then to the sub-committee, where it is initiated by the Resident Commissioner; then it goes before the Board in the manner described, then it goes to the clerk, who keeps the Sub-Committee Book, to be entered, then the document itself passes to inspection office, to be written on to manager and Inspector; then it passes to registry and salary office, where the salary is sent, less the amount of the fine. In the mean time the manager has written once a week for the salary; each letter has to be noted—that is, the circumstance of the case written on each of the manager's letters, which, in 300 or 400 cases, is very important, the letter ultimately goes to the Secretary. The Secretary may demand original documents, which is nearly always the case; then comes a search for papers which may be in any period of their travels, and may occupy an hour in the search. The clerk, after looking out for a whole week for the Chief of Inspection—1—Looking out for the Chief of Inspection?

25246. Yes! Is that now a correct view of what may occur in such a case?—I followed the question very closely, and I can answer it. I think the voyage on which the letter is described as going is pretty accurate; but the inference would be that the delays are very considerable, which are not at all necessary. The case might pass through all these departments in one, two, or three days, or it might take longer; but a document going astray is the exception. One per cent, perhaps, of the papers might go astray, and great delay might occur. I have had such cases, but these are unexceptionable when one is dealing with a great mass of papers, and as to looking for a week or a month for a Chief of Inspection, one or other of the Chiefs of Inspection is at the office every day. The clerk has nothing to do but to go to him.

25247. Rev. Mr. Corne—May I ask do you not adopt the plan by which letter, remittance, and answer all travel on together?—Yes, all in the one. The letter is marked R.O., Salary Office, R.O., Registry Office, and action is recorded in one paper, but there may be a great mass of correspondence connected with that one paper.

25248. Ah, there may be none at all!—There may be none at all.

25249. One single sheet may contain a reference to twenty papers?—No be sure.

25250. So that it appears a vast deal more complicated in description than it may be in reality?—That is the case.

25251. Mr. Gibson—Are you aware of any case that fulfils all the operations Professor Sullivan has mentioned?—I don't know of any case that accords entirely with the description.

25252. Mr. Sullivan—Now, if the system of Mr. McCreehy were carried out, wouldn't it greatly diminish the time in a case like that?—I said at the beginning I did not know what Mr. McCreehy's system was.

25253. Suppose, for example, the Registry Office, the Inspection Office, and the Correspondence Office were all amalgamated, and that each district was placed in the hands of three or more clerks, or whatever number would be necessary to do it, and that these clerks should perform the duty of opening the letters—that would represent the inspection department, and put on the noting, and do all that would be now done in the inspection office; then write the note that is to be forwarded, and conduct the correspondence relative to each case. If that was done, would it not be likely that all this round about process would be reduced to a day or so?—I don't think so. It would rather produce confusion, and it would be contrary to the principle of division of labour, by assuming that all clerks

are of the same capacities and of the same powers, and that they can deal with one class of work as well as they can with another. I think each clerk's work should, as far as possible, be homogeneous.

25254. Are you singular in that, or is it that the general impression?—I have not heard the question discussed, so that I cannot say whether I am singular or not; I merely state my own opinion about it.

25255. Still if a plan were discovered that would get rid of all that round about process, which you admit is a pretty accurate statement of what comes, would it be a considerable gain to the service?—Yes, I think so. If you can shorten processes without interfering with the correctness and accuracy of official business, you confer a boon upon the office.

25256. Has this matter been at all considered—the question of reducing the routine—has it been at all considered by the Board?—No; I have myself reduced action considerably in various ways.

25257. Do not the delays in the transaction of routine business form a chief cause of complaint by managers?—We have very few complaints lately.

25258. But it used to be?—It seems to be a thing of the past.

25259. May not that be accounted for by the fact that the whole system of the Board of Education is being gone into by the Commission?—No; now we have few cases of delay, the documents come in one week, and are disposed of before the end of the next week. This is considerable despatch. In a great department like the Education Office there must be some complaints.

25260. And is that the case where fines are inflicted at the period of the payment of the salaries?—There may be some exception. Fines are as few, there cannot be many cases. One case might make a great noise, and cause a reflection on the whole department.

25261. The Clerksman—Whatever may be the routine you go through, has the Board of Education had any interest in simplifying processes?—Quite the contrary; the desire is to simplify everything.

25262. Mr. Sullivan—Who is responsible for drawing up the programme—who does draw it up in the fact?—I draw up the programme.

25263. The programme for the examination of teachers?—That is drawn up on consultation. It was first drawn up by the Head Inspectors, in conference, but it has been once or twice arranged in consultation, sometimes with District Inspectors, who are considered good judges of such matters, and always in connection with the Chiefs of Inspection. There are some changes contemplated in the programme for the examination of schools, which is a kindred subject, and it is under consideration of the Chiefs of Inspection, and one of the Head Inspectors, and now lies on my desk to see if I fall in with it, and then it must meet with the approval of the Board.

25264. Have the professors anything to do with the drawing up of it?—Yes, they have been consulted.

25265. Who recommends the books that are named in the foot notes?—The same parties.

25266. Then any one of the professors may recommend his own book, and insist it shall be taken?—It is a very common thing for a professor to recommend his own book.

25267. But, where the professor is enabled to sell, in the case of three books, in the course of ten years, at the rate of nearly £10,000 worth a year, it is not small?—That was the case of the late Professor Sullivan. I think he is the only one of the professors who did that. His work was put at the foot note. We put such and such books at the foot note, because we think them the best.

25268. These programmes are issued by the Secretary; the Secretaries' names are attached?—Almost all documents issued have the Secretaries' names attached.

25269. They are to be looked on as official acts of the Board?—They are.

25270. The Board is to be taken as having recommended the book to be used, which appears in the list?—The Board is answerable for everything; they

Feb. 17, 1902.

W. E. Newell,  
Opp., 11-2.

are answerable for the acts of their Secretaries, or board by those acts.

25271. What I mean is, they are to be understood as really responsible as a public body, for the selection of that book of their own professor?—Yes, I think so.

25272. They give by that fact an absolute monopoly of the books. The very fact of having put the book in their list, as they have put other books, shows that they approve of this book?—Yes, amongst the books in this particular document, which I speak of, in which the teachers are to be examined, is this book. There are a great number of books of Professors Galbreath and Haughton, which have been recently put in the list, and they, no doubt, will be put in the programme.

25273. Up to the present in the return given to the Royal Commissioners, in all the actual acting they recommended but one class of books—in the memorandum they themselves entered, there is but one class of books, besides the books of the Board, the books of the late Professor?—The books in the Commissioners' list.

25274. One other point, who draws up the questions for answering?—The Head Inspectors.

25275. I find under the head of *Imman books*, page 697, the following question:—"Specify the three principal reasons by which the due proportion of oxygen is preserved in the atmosphere, notwithstanding the immense consumption of oxygen by men and animals during the process of respiration," also, "specify the different families of the Biptera, as in Patterson's *Ecology*, with the characteristics of each, and describe the species of *Vulture* which appears to be the connecting link between the *Vulture* and the eagle?"—That is a question in natural history.

25276. One other question. Under the head *Natural philosophy* is the following:—"Describe three of the compounds formed by chlorine and oxygen, giving the symbol and equivalent of each, and state how the goodness of bleaching salt may be ascertained." And again, "In what condition is arsenic found in nature? To what use is it applied in the arts, and name an antidote for it, and explain the effect of the antidote." You say the Head Inspectors have drawn up those questions?—These have been drawn up by some one of them; I could not say by which.

25277. Natural history and chemistry form part of the subjects for classification?—Of the first-class teachers. The elementary parts of these subjects and those questions are taken from Professor McGulley's "Natural Philosophy."

25278. Would it be correct if it was stated the Board did not intend that lectures should be given in any of these subjects by any of the professors—for instance, lectures on chemistry?—I never heard any prohibition by the Commissioners against chemistry.

25279. Is it any portion of his business? Do you consider it portion of his business to do so?—I do.

25280. And does the Professor of Natural Philosophy?—The late Professor of Natural Philosophy, Dr. Clarke, used to give lectures on chemistry; he was not prohibited, and, on the contrary, I think his lectures were very much approved of in the schools in which he lectured.

25281. Do you think it is part of his duty to do so, that it is implied by the preparation of the questions?—It would not follow that it was his duty to give lectures because the Head Inspector of Normal schools does give questions in chemistry to the teachers. I do not see any connexion between the two things.

25282. Who is responsible for the following return for the central training establishment?—"In the course of lectures to the teachers that are to be given by the respective professors in the science department, special instruction is given by Mr. Butler, assisted by Mr. O'Sullivan, in the following subjects:—arithmetic, geometry, mensuration, the elements of trigonometry and navigation, the most useful and important parts connected with mechanics, hydrostatics, pneumatics, optics, dynamics, and geology, and chemistry, with particular reference to the lesson-books published by the

Board?—The professors make that return. There is not one of those subjects that is not taught in the model schools.

25283. Then we are to consider this return states accurately really what the Commissioners expect to be done in the training department?—Yes, what is taught one time or another in the training department.

25284. How are I to reconcile this return with the statement of the professor of natural philosophy himself, that these are not portions of his duty?—I don't know.

25285. Who is in charge in Marlborough-street of the books and apparatus?—Mr. Todd, the store-keeper.

25286. Is it his business to collect the apparatus and the materials that are to be employed?—For what purpose?

25287. For distribution to the schools?—No.

25288. Who does that?—The Inspector.

25289. You formerly distributed a considerable amount of apparatus through the different model schools?—Yes.

25290. And of materials and other things?—Yes.

25291. Who was the selector of these?—They were all selected by Dr. Clarke, I think. I do not think that any have been distributed since, except two or three things some head masters asked for.

25292. You are quite satisfied Dr. Clarke had something to do with the selection of the apparatus or minerals?—I know it as a fact he had.

25293. That he was consulted about it?—He took on himself to make the selection.

25294. In all cases?—I cannot say in all cases. I only speak of what I know of my own knowledge, and I think he selected apparatus as long as he was lecturer on physical science.

25295. Was that a part of his official duty?—I do not know that it was specified as his official duty, but he took on himself to do it.

25296. Who collects now in geology and mineralogy?—No one.

25297. How long is that the case?—Since Dr. Clarke's death.

25298. Has the present professor anything to do with that?—He is supposed to take it up. He has not, as far as I know, taken up geology and mineralogy.

25299. I mean the selection of the things for the model school?—He has nothing to do with that duty. You refer to all the model schools.

25300. All model schools, the whole selection of apparatus?—These things are selected by the Inspectors now.

25301. But you are quite certain Dr. Clarke selected them?—I am quite certain. I have known Dr. Clarke to select them in many cases.

25302. Do you know whether he had the charging of the cost of the articles?—I don't know whether he had or not. He used to sign accounts, for I have counter-signed them myself. The articles were generally required for the model school, where he was going to lecture. These articles remained behind that the teachers might carry on the instruction.

25303. Were percentages allowed on the part of the seller to the officers of the Board on any occasion?—I never heard of any allowance of that sort was made. It was made to the officer of the Board by the party selling the article. The Commissioners knew nothing of it. It would not appear on the face of the bill.

25304. That I understand. But you yourself were Head Inspector at the time all the apparatus was being circulated through the country?—Not all the time.

25305. I mean you were part of the time?—I was.

25306. Did you ever examine that apparatus?—Sometimes I did. When Dr. Clarke was there he understood this subject very much better than I did myself, so that I took his word for most of the things.

25307. Were not most of the things mere toys?—I don't think so—entirely not the geological and mineralogical specimens.

Feb. 17, 1888.

W. H. Newell,  
Esq., LL.D.

25308. If the articles were all shaken up in a box, and wrong labels put on the specimens, would that be a true statement of the case?—I never heard an imputation of that sort.

25309. You are not aware of what state they are in now, in the different model schools?—No, I have not been in the model schools for some time. I don't think there is much attention directed to the mineralogical or geological articles.

25310. I speak of all the articles?—I should think in the respective district model schools, they are in a

very fair condition, particularly since the Department of Science and Art has called attention to the subjects, but in the Central Department they are very finely lying by in rest and dark.

25311. Would you be surprised that my impression of it lately is not very favorable to the state in which they are?—No.

25312. I mean the country districts?—No, I don't now know anything about the articles in the country districts.

[Adjourned.]

## SIXTH-SIXTH DAY.—DUBLIN, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1888.

## PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, K.P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CHORLECK.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., M.C.

ROY. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
REV. BRIGIANUS MORGAN COWIE, M.A.  
JAMES ANTHONY DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q.C.  
SCOTT NASHMYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SHERIDAN, Esq., M.P.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } *Secretaries*  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

Feb. 18, 1888.

THOMAS W.  
ALLEN, Esq.,  
M.A.

THOMAS W. ALLEN, Esq., M.A., *Secretary to the Catholic Poor School Committee of England*, sworn and examined.

25313. The Chairman.—How long have you been secretary to the Catholic Poor School Committee in England?—Fifteen years and a half.

25314. Did that committee exist before it entered into relations with the Committee of Council on Education?—Yes, it may be said to have been created for that purpose so much as anything, but it existed just before.

25315. Will you explain to the Commissioners the manner in which that committee transacts its business with the Committee of Council?—I had better, perhaps, state the constitution of the committee, in order to bring that out. The committee consists of forty-five members—three representatives for each of the fifteen Catholic dioceses of Great Britain—with the exception of one, which is not in communion with it—a diocese in the extreme north with a very small population. The committee represents fifteen out of the sixteen dioceses. Of the three representatives from each diocese two are laymen and one a clergyman. All are nominated originally by the bishop, but continuing in until they resign or are removed, which is uncommon. They may meet any number of times, but, in practice, they meet once a year at a general meeting, and they have a standing sub-committee in London, which manages any business that may arise in the interim—from one general meeting to another; that is, whenever anything arises which touches the whole Catholic body. They represent the bishops in that respect.

25316. Are the representatives of each diocese named by the bishop of the diocese?—By the bishop of the diocese.

25317. Absolutely, on subject to the approval of any persons in the diocese?—Absolutely.

25318. Are they removable?—Yes.

25319. Does it often change otherwise than by resignation?—I think not. I don't remember an instance. But it is not uncommon for them to resign, feeling they cannot attend. I have seen a great many changes on that account.

25320. Lord Chorleck.—Have any ever been removed by authority?—I think not. I don't remember any instance of any one removed by authority.

25321. The Chairman.—Are the bishops or the archbishops a member of that committee or office?—None of the bishops are members of it, because they stand in a particular relation to it. It is their committee

in fact. It represents them, but they are not members of it. The general meeting of the committee and the annual meeting of the bishops in London take place at the same time, on purpose, in order that the bishops may communicate to us anything they desire to be done, and they learn from us anything we wish to lay before them.

25322. When the Roman Catholic schools were first taken into union with the Committee of Council were the communications conducted by the committee of which you are secretary?—Yes.

25323. Was the making of these arrangements spread over a long time, or was it shortly arranged?—The union with the Committee of Council was shortly arranged, but there ensued a correspondence of great importance, which was spread over several years, and which concerned the arrangements for asking building grants, especially to our schools.

25324. Have the arrangements respecting Roman Catholic schools been materially modified since their original institution?—Not at all.

25325. Will you state what is the outline of these arrangements?—They are contained in a minute of Council of December, 1847. I think the shortest way will be to read it, as that gives the terms exactly. On the 18th of December, 1847, the Committee of Council on Education passed a minute, defining the conditions of aid to Roman Catholic schools. These conditions are as follows:—

"1. That the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee be the ordinary channel of such general inquiries as may be desirable, as to any school applying for aid as a Roman Catholic school. 2. That Roman Catholic schools receiving aid from the Parliamentary grant be open to inspection, but that the inspectors shall report respecting the sanitary condition only. 3. That the inspectors of such schools be not appointed without the previous concurrence of the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee. 4. That as gratuity, stipend, or augmentation of salary be assigned to schoolmasters or assistant teachers who are in holy orders, but that their lordships reserve to themselves the power of making an exception in the case of training schools, and model schools connected therewith."

These terms have been kept, both in letter and spirit, without any difficulty arising on either side.

25326. What are the arrangements as regards building grants?—The correspondence to which I alluded



before as stretching over several years turned on the settlement of the trust deed of schools, and more especially on the management clause with regard to them. I have drawn out in as few words as possible what was the substance of that correspondence stretching over three or four years. It will give the exact point at issue, which was one of considerable importance. This correspondence began in 1858, and ended in March, 1859. The principle involved was that the Roman Catholic Church claims for her clergy the sole and exclusive charge of the religious and moral training of her children, and a power to frame the regulations connected therewith. The discussion throughout turned on the application of this principle. In order to carry it out the Poor School Committee claimed that the power of deciding in case of a dispute arising in the managing committee of a school, whether or not any particular matter does or does not affect religion should be in the spiritual authority. On the other side, the Privy Council required that such power (which it terms simply absolute) should be one of those vested by the management clause in the depositaries of the appellate jurisdiction. The appellate jurisdiction as proposed was an arbitrator appointed by the Roman Catholic Bishop; another, an inspector of schools, to be appointed by the Lord President, a third to be appointed by the two former, or else by the senior Roman Catholic Bishop and the Lord President conjointly. On the above difference mine was joined, neither party would yield. At last the Poor School Committee suggested that a model deed should be prepared, which removed from the face of the trust deeds all reference to any appeal whatever, merely stating that matters of a religious character are to be wholly reserved to the ecclesiastical authorities, while matters of a merely secular character may be submitted to the decision of the committee generally. The model deed was constructed on this, including any appeal, except on a very minor point, that is, in case the priest—who is on the committee, and has the entire direction with regard to religious matters—should consider there had been any fault in the teacher on that subject, and suspend him temporarily; then there was an appeal to the bishop on that point, and the bishop's decision is final. But that was not the point on which the controversy turned. That was a point in which there was no difficulty.

25337. In any of your ordinary schools is there a school committee of which laymen are members?—Yes.

25338. Is the priest an ex officio member or president of it?—If he is present he would be chairman, but if he happens not to be present, another member must be elected as chairman for the time.

25339. Do they regulate the teaching and discipline of the school on questions arising from them?—The managing committee regulate the teaching and discipline of the school, always understanding that the priest or if more than one, the clergy have the entire management of the religious part of the teaching.

25340. Are all your schools purely secular buildings or are any of them attached to convents or monasteries?—Some are, no doubt, attached to convents and monasteries—convents certainly.

25341. Do you get any building grants from the Privy Council for schools that are not secular?—The Privy Council make no grant to any building which transfers the private property of any convent or monastery. Neither do we—we are a poor school committee.

25342. How do you do?—There is no building grant made to any convent school as such?—No building grants.

25343. The Chairwoman.—Have many of your schools received building grants?—Only sixty-four to the end of 1867.

25344. Are they vested in individual trustees, or in poor committees?—In individual trustees always.

25345. Are they gentlemen connected with the neighbourhood or simply priests?—They are both; they are very often the bishop of the diocese with other priests. That is entirely for the builders of the particular school themselves to manage. We do not interfere with that. I think whenever the Committee

of Council make a grant, they enjoin that it should be vested in one or two laymen, as well as clergymen.

25346. Mr. Stokes.—Do you know the reason of that regulation?—The reason that they assigned was that it is much more easy to trace the descendants in case of laymen, as priests can have only lateral descendants.

25347. The Chairwoman.—And that in case of the trustees dying out, they could refer to the ancestors?—Yes.

25348. We have understood from a previous witness that the Inspectors examine only in the secular education?—That was part of the original agreement.

25349. How many Roman Catholic Inspectors are there under the Committee of Council?—Three.

25350. Where is the Roman Catholic training school—male teachers?—At Hammer-smith.

25351. When was that established?—I think it was in 1852.

25352. Was that put in connexion with the Committee of Council on its first origin?—Yes, or immediately.

25353. Mr. Stokes.—Did it not receive a building grant?—Yes it did. That it must have been in connexion from the beginning.

25354. The Chairwoman.—Do you know what the amount of the building grant was?—There were two building grants. I forget at this moment the first, but the second was £5,500. The establishment was originally intended to receive students of a religious teaching order, not in holy orders. We found very great difficulty in getting subjects. A few years after it was enlarged, and then we got a grant from the Privy Council for that enlargement to admit secular teachers, and the main part of them are secular.

25355. What was the religious teaching order for which it was at first intended?—It was intended to take an order which had been instituted by the Abbé Lamennais a few years before; we found it better to modify the institution to the use of England, so that they could hardly be called "Lamennaisian Brothers." We placed there a superior who was independent of the Head, and he modified the institution as he thought requisite.

25356. How many teachers does it contain at present?—I think there are forty-two at present, twenty-four of the second year and eighteen of the first year.

25357. Does the course last two years?—Two years.

25358. What ages do they enter at?—From eighteen upwards.

25359. Do you publish any annual statement of the accounts of the training school?—Yes, we publish a Privy Council account. Thus we introduce in our Report, which is annual.

25360. What was the net total income for the last year?—The last year I think I have not got made up; but for the year 1867 the total income was £3,153 4s.

25361. How much did you get from the Privy Council in that year?—£694.

25362. And from the Poor School Committee?—£1,169. Fees of students, 245.

25363. By whom was the teaching in this school conducted?—By the superior and a number of teachers.

25364. Is the superior an ecclesiastic?—He is.

25365. A priest or a monk?—A priest.

25366. A secular priest?—Well, he is neither secular nor regular, but intermediate. The Ordination to which he belongs makes us pronounce between the two.

25367. What are the teachers under him?—There is a Vice-President, the Rev. Mr. Graham, who is in holy orders, a secular priest, and a number of lay teachers.

25368. Are any of these lay teachers connected with orders, like the Christian Brothers?—There may be, and have been, I think. There are one or two that are Xaverian Brothers. Our desire was to get if we could, a number of religious students; we should have had a great many more if we could have managed, but we found it difficult. We would gladly have developed the whole thing into a school of religious teachers,

Feb. 18, 1868.

Thomas W. Allen, Clerk.

Feb. 16, 1869.

Thomas W.  
Abbott, Esq.,  
R.A.

under the management exclusively of religious teachers, not intending that all those who came out should be religious teachers, but that those who managed the school should be religious teachers. We have not succeeded in that, the difficulty of finding subjects was so great.

25359. Do you readily find schools for male teachers over Ireland?—The difficulty has been to find a sufficient supply of good male teachers. That has been always a difficulty.

25360. Are any of the schools in connexion with your Committee taught by Protestant teachers?—None.

25361. Are any of them taught by teachers brought over from Ireland?—Yes, any teacher may come over from Ireland, and if he can find employment in one of our schools, he is welcome to do so.

25362. Some trained under the National Board?—Yes, but as you are aware, their classification here does not hold in England. They would not be accredited certificated teachers in England, in virtue of their certificates in Ireland.

25363. They would have to pass an examination?—Yes, some examination as other teachers without a certificate would have to pass.

25364. Where is the female training college?—At Liverpool.

25365. What number of females in training does that contain?—About seventy. Perhaps, one or two more or less, generally about seventy, of whom thirty-five are of each year.

25366. Who are the persons who have the management of that institution?—The Sisters of Notre Dame.

25367. Did that institution receive any building grant?—No.

25368. Why?—They preferred to use buildings of their own. They had at that time very fair buildings in one of the best parts of Liverpool. They have since built, at their own expense, a most admirable training school, with an excellent chapel attached to it. In

fact, their institution may be considered perfect in all respects, with regard to the accommodation for training students.

25369. Is the whole institution managed by the convent authorities, they being in connexion with the Catholic Poor School Committee?—I should hardly put it in that way I think, because we have a financial committee, several members of our own body, of which I am secretary, as general secretary of the Committee, which attends yearly to the financial accounts, which is responsible to the Privy Council, and which engages to the Privy Council to supply whatever is deficient.

25370. Are the building and establishment under the discipline and management of the ladies of the convent?—Yes, certainly, with the proviso that the Poor School Committee are cognisant of all that goes on, and that it is in a certain sense their training-school, only in a certain sense with the restrictions I have mentioned.

25371. Would it be competent for either—either ladies of the convent, or for the Catholic Poor School Committee to disown the connexion?—Certainly.

25372. How long do the teachers in training remain there?—Two years.

25373. Have you any difficulty in finding places for them?—No, I think not. If there has been any difficulty it has arisen in the last five years, since the alteration of the Committee of Council in that respect.

25374. Lord Clarendon?—What proportion does the Privy Council grant bear to the whole expense of that establishment?—It must not exceed seventy-five per cent., not again £35 per head per student.

25375. You said what was out of pocket, and they did not ask you for much?—Well, there are some subscriptions. I will read the official statement made to the Privy Council.

25376. The *Clockwork*.—For the year 1867?—Yes.

Account of the Income and Expenditure of the Liverpool Roman Catholic Training-school, for the year ending December 31, 1867, showing the amount actually received and disbursed during the year; the number of students resident throughout the year, admitted pursuant to Act. 107, was seventy-two.

Dr.	£	s.	d.
To balance on 1st January, 1867.	65	3	6
„ grants from the Committee of Council.	1,874	16	0
„ grants from Catholic Poor School Committee.	500	0	0
„ donations.	150	0	0
„ fees of forty-four students (full fee being £1 per head).	192	0	0
„ amount received for books sold to students.	50	16	4
„ interest on money in bank.	9	13	6
	£2,003	9	0
To balance overdrawn.	3	9	4
	£2,008	18	4

Cr.	£	s.	d.
By salaries of teachers.	490	0	0
„ books, apparatus, and stationery.	31	2	4
„ printing, postage, and other office charges.	18	2	0
„ board of and teachers, seventy-two students, and five servants.	1,633	11	0
„ washing.	108	0	0
„ wages of five servants.	60	0	0
„ fuel and lights.	75	2	4
„ medical attendance for seventy-two students.	30	18	4
„ replacement of furniture and repairs.	157	10	1
„ rent, rates, taxes, and insurance.	399	19	4
„ net cost of garden.	6	3	0
„ chapel expenses.	86	0	0
	£2,008	18	4

25377. The *Clockwork*.—Is that £5 the annual fee paid by the parents of the children, or by benevolent persons?—It is paid by the students on entering in case the sisters consider they are able to pay it. They don't by any means require it in every case.

25378. A proposition are free?—I think they consider the fee an ordinary thing to be asked, but in special cases of merit and of poverty they would not insist upon it. Each student of eighteen or upwards would pay a £5 entrance-fee.

25379. Have any disputes or differences arisen between your Committee and the Committee of Council of a serious character on any occasion whatsoever?—Well, during the fifteen years I have been secretary, I don't remember any. Nothing particular remains in my mind.

25380. Any dispute about any particular branch as touching or management?—No, the discussion of which I have given a summary respecting the management clause settled everything, and since then we have had nothing that could be termed a dispute on a matter of principle. In virtue of that settlement we

have gone on in perfect harmony since. There may have been a little incident as to which we asked a correction, and so on.

25381. Canon Toke, from Manchester, told us there were two Protestant children in his school at Manchester. Can you tell us whether there is any appreciable number of Protestant children taught in your schools through the country?—I should think there may be some here and there, but not generally. It is not a thing that comes before us ordinarily.

25382. Are there any rules of your Committee or arrangements made as to those children who receive secular instruction without being forced to receive the religious teaching?—I don't think that any such rules exist on paper, but I think there would be no difficulty whatever in the matter. I don't think a case has come before us in any way.

25383. Is it the practice in any of your schools that when religious instruction is given any Protestant children in the school should be desired to withdraw?—Well there is a statement here on the very matter, which as it comes from authority, it would be better

to give it to you, as it is precisely to the point. In the year 1847, when the Committee of which I am secretary did not exist, but the Catholic Institute which it succeeded did exist, and spoke as the voice of the bishops, they expressed the principles which form part of the original conditions mentioned in the letter of Lord John Russell, and which were the basis of the *four articles* of the Minutes of Council that I read at the commencement of my evidence. One of these principles so laid down was number 5—"Children whose parents could not object to the religious instruction to be permitted to partake of the secular instruction without attending at the hours of religious instruction." It was stated with regard to the first head, the Committee of the Catholic Institute are authorised by the Roman Catholic Vicars Apostolic in England and Wales to correspond for the present with Her Majesty's Government, therefore, I may say with strict propriety, that the bishops themselves have given the answer I am about to state. There is first a discussion about the word religious. In what sense it is used, into which discussion I think I need not go. It says—

"If, however, under this head Lord John Russell intends to refer by the term religious to what the Committee feel provided for by Law, that is to say, namely, to catechetical instruction on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, they have no difficulty in not only sanctioning but assisting in a principle so much in accordance with the doctrine of their holy religion, that children whose parents conscientiously object thereto, should not be required to attend during the time of such catechetical instruction. The Committee in making these observations do so under an explicit understanding, that by sanctioning this arrangement, no avowed distinction is intended thereby to be drawn between orders to be observed in Roman Catholic schools and those observed in other schools aided by grants from the State. They beg further to express their sincere hope that in being called on to sanction in Roman Catholic schools a principle so just, the Committee of Council on Education may be induced by Lord John Russell to enforce a similar principle throughout all the schools subject to their inspection, and especially to enact an explicit rule that in all workhouses and prison schools subject to their control no child should be educated in a religion or forced to attend a religious service other than that of the parents or surviving parent, or in the case of orphans of that in which they have been born."

25384. Are you, yourself, aware of any schools in which there is any number of Protestant children?—No, I am aware that now and then there are Protestant children, because when applications for separate grants come before us, now and then, it is mentioned that there are Protestant children in the school.

25385. The schools under your committee are not obliged to adopt any conscience clause?—They are not.

25386. Are you aware whether the adoption of a conscience clause in the school at Talacre, was before that arrangement was made by the Roman Catholic authorities, or subsequently?—Subsequently, certainly, because this was at the very time before any union had taken place.

25387. Can you explain whether the promoters of that school were required by the Privy Council to adopt a conscience clause, or whether they volunteered to adopt it?—No, I don't know of the case.

25388. Mr. Stoker.—Do you remember how it happened that the trust deed for Catholic schools receiving building grants from the Privy Council did not contain the conscience clause?—No, I don't.

25389. Is it within your recollection that the first draft of the model deed forwarded to the Privy Council by the Catholic Poor School Committee did contain the conscience clause, and that it was only on the discovery that the Church of England Deeds had no conscience clause inserted that the Catholic Poor School Committee declined to have their schools put upon the same footing, and withdrew the conscience clause which they had inserted?—I don't remember that. There was clearly no objection on the part of the Catholics to the conscience clause, on the contrary, here is the statement I have read and made in the name of the Catholic bishops, approving of a conscience clause, that is, that as child should be required to attend catechetical

instruction in the religion in which its parents did not believe, thus approving of such a conscience clause being introduced into the deeds for all schools, Catholic or otherwise.

25390. Do you possess any information with regard to the population of Talacre?—I do not.

25391. Are you aware that a large estate is held there by a Catholic landlord, but that his tenants are principally Protestants?—I know of the estate, but not of the circumstances connected with it.

25392. You cannot say if it was that peculiar condition of affairs which induced the Privy Council in that case to insist upon a conscience clause?—No, I know nothing of the case.

25393. The Chairman.—Supposing a Roman Catholic landlord, anywhere in England, desired to put up a school, could he, under the arrangements now made with the Privy Council, be required to accept the conscience clause?—No, the Privy Council might appeal to this correspondence, but it is not part of our present arrangement, that we have to have a conscience clause.

25394. Mr. Stoker.—Did any correspondence respecting a school upon the estate of Sir R. Gerard, between Ashton de Willocks and Wigan, come under your particular notice?—No.

25395. Can you say whether in that particular case Sir R. Gerard tried to build a school, and the Catholics met and said that the management of the school should be given to the Catholic priest, in whom they had confidence, though the majority of them were Protestants, on which application was made to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council decreed so much to the school being in Catholic hands, that no grant was made?—Was this lately?

25396. Four or five years ago?—No, I don't remember the case.

25397. Mr. Robert Knox.—In the extract you have read respecting the Catholic bishops, there was an expression of their willingness to agree to a clause, providing that no children should be compelled to attend any religious instruction of which their parents did not conscientiously approve?—Yes.

25398. In the management of the National Board in this country at present, provision has been made somewhat more stringent than that, and the rule of the National Board now is, that no child shall be allowed to attend any religious instruction other than that to which his parents belong, unless on the written authority of those parents.

25399. Do you think that such an arrangement as that would be accepted now by the Poor School Committee?—I don't think they would like that on another ground. They would think it interfered with the general teaching of the school. I was careful in what I said that they accepted a particular conscience clause. Another conscience clause might be easily constructed to which every Catholic in England would bear the greatest possible dislike. Any conscience clause that would interfere with the ordinary teaching of the school.

25400. In what way would a conscience clause to the effect of not allowing a child to attend differ in its action from that of a conscience clause that they should not be compelled to attend?—There is the effect that the religious feeling should run through the whole teaching in a school. Now, for instance, on the subject of history. However elementary the teaching of history, in a poor school in which the children do not exceed ten or twelve years of age may be, and however limited in amount some history must be taught, and the whole of the history taught would be taught in one way by a Catholic, and in another way by a Protestant; such a conscience clause as you suggest might be stretched to mean that no child should be allowed to have any teaching that might interfere with the just convictions. Now, for instance, in teaching the incidents of the sixteenth century, is the teaching to agree in the case of two children, one a Catholic, and the other a Protestant?

25401. Do you, in your ordinary primary Catholic schools, introduce much of this controversial portion

Feb. 18, 1869.

Thomas W. Ashton, Esq.,  
M.A.

Feb. 18, 1869.

Thomas W.  
Allen, esq.,  
&c.

of history?—I do not mean controversial. I refer to the whole *time* of history, from the first to the eighteenth century, a Catholic would teach it one way, and a Protestant the other, therefore it must be either Catholic or Protestant.

25402. You consider then that the existence of such an element in the general instruction of the school would interfere with the existence of the conscience clause, by which children would be prevented attending the religious instruction, which takes place at certain definite times?—No, I think that is another point. I see no difficulty about a conscience clause which would exempt a child from attending special religious or catechetical instruction, while I see a difficulty in it if it were stretched so as to modify the whole teaching of the school, and it must be so in the case I mention. History must be taught one way or the other. It cannot be between the two. If it is not taught in a Catholic sense, it must be taught in an anti-Catholic sense.

25403. Mr. Stales.—Are you aware how that difficulty is met in the case of the Irish National schools?—I fancy it is not met at all. It must be taught in an anti-Catholic way, except when a school is Catholic.

25404. Do you know that history is excluded?—I was not aware of that.

25405. Sir Robert Kane.—Would you approve of solving the difficulty about history by the method of exclusion?—It seems to me that the school which would not teach history is no school at all.

25406. Then it is your impression that a conscience clause which would merely refer to that portion of religious instruction in the Catechism and frontiers of the Church, that is given at certain stated hours, would not really fulfil the object of preserving the faith of a child from the religious influence of a school belonging to another religious denomination?—Well, I should consider that, as a general rule, a child who attends a school which is really Catholic will derive Catholic doctrine, and feelings, and sympathies from it, and so in the same way will a child attending a Protestant school derive the same results from it; that it would lie in the general teaching of the school, but no doubt anything like an attempt at direct proselytism may be avoided by such a conscience clause as we are considering; a conscience clause that would be restricted to enabling a child not to be present at definite religious instruction. I do not mean in what I am saying, to suppose there would be any active proselytism going on either in a Protestant or a Catholic school, but that the natural effect of the general school teaching would be, that a certain body of truth, at any rate on the Catholic side, is infused into the whole teaching of the school. So it ought to be, I mean, and in my opinion a school is not a school unless that is done.

25407. In the Catholic schools that are under the management of the committee you represent, you have particular portions of the day set apart for religious instruction, have you not?—No fixed time in the schools, if this is the meaning of the question.

25408. I do not mean that you have the same hour in all the schools, but that in every school there are certain hours set apart for the secular instruction, and certain hours set apart for the religious instruction?—I have no doubt that is the case. No doubt there is certain definite religious instruction at certain times.

25409. Mr. Stales.—Are there any schools under the direct management of the Catholic Poor School Committee?—None, unless we may so call the parishing schools of the training schools.

25410. Is not the management of each school left to the local managers?—Entirely.

25411. Sir Robert Kane.—The Poor School Committee does not preserve any control over the action of the managers?—Not at all, any more than, of course, to see that they are Catholic, and teach in accordance with Catholic doctrine generally.

25412. Does any portion of the correspondence of managers of Privy Council office pass through the

Catholic Poor School Committee?—Any part of it may. A manager, for instance, if he has anything to discuss with the Privy Council, and thinks that we would do better than he would, may apply to us to communicate with the Privy Council; if, for instance, a correspondence necessarily involves any principle the manager would most naturally apply to us.

25413. Are the members of the Catholic Poor School Committee furnished from time to time with instructions as to their conduct of business by the bishops?—If by that is meant official instructions, certainly not. Of course, as individual members they may at any time communicate with their bishop, asking what he would desire on any particular point, but as members of the committee they are perfectly independent, save that, perhaps, a disunion might be drawn between lay members and the clergy. The clerical routine for each diocese is very often the vicar-general of the bishop, and he knows his intimate feelings, and certainly knows the principles upon which he would act, and so on. He is in continuous intercourse with him.

25414. The committee may be considered as representing the bishops?—It represents them. If it was, for instance, to conduct a correspondence with the Privy Council on matters of principle, it would so exactly represent them that it would do nothing without their consent. In ordinary matters they are quite free to act. They are under no subjection to the bishops as a committee any more than that they would naturally represent what the bishops desired.

25415. Mr. Deane.—The members of the committee are appointed by the bishop?—Yes.

25416. The bishop is looked up to by the Catholics of his diocese as the person to nominate the members?—Yes.

25417. And he so far he appoints them officially?—Certainly.

25418. Sir Robert Kane.—The committee may be taken as representing the feelings and authority of the episcopal body, and none of them in any way represents the laity?—On the contrary, the lay element is double in number to the clerical element, and so every resolution of the Poor School Committee is by majority, of course the lay element tells with double effect as that of the clerical.

25419. Those lay gentlemen having been originally selected by the bishop?—Yes.

25420. I believe a short time since there was a meeting held in London of the Roman Catholic body, which came to some resolution on the subject of education. One of the resolutions objected to any kind of conscience clause. Are you aware of that meeting? It was held within the last few weeks?—It must have been a partial meeting, for there has been no general meeting for some time past. If it was a meeting held lately it must have been a meeting in some particular parish or parishes. I am well aware there are persons who object to a conscience clause.

25421. Do you consider yourself authorised to inform the Commissioners that in your opinion the bishops if consulted now would be of the same opinion as was expressed in 1847, in the correspondence with Lord John Russell, and would approve of the conscience clause?—All that I should say on that head would be, that in the year 1847 the committee representing the bishops made a public statement that such a conscience clause as has been mentioned, that is, restricted to enabling any child not to be present at catechetical or religious instruction, unless its parents desire it, was just. That statement was publicly made and sanctioned, and it bears, therefore, the authority of the bishops of that day. I am not restricted to speak upon what they would do now.

25422. We have had unfortunately in this country brought under our notice the fact, that in 1847, the Roman Catholic bishops of this country were very generally ardent friends of the system of National education as carried out by our Board here, and that in the twenty years that have since elapsed they have considerably altered that opinion. Can you form any opinion whether the ideas of the Catholic authorities in England with regard to the operation of a conscience

change may not have similarly changed it—I am not empowered to speak on that; all that I would observe is, that in this passage which I have read, they state not that it is expedient but that it is just, and what was just in 1847 is certainly just in 1869.

25423. Mr. Deane.—Have the bishops of England ever made any public statement adverse to what is stated to be their opinion in what you have read?—Not collectively, that I am aware.

25424. Mr. Stokes.—Have any individual members from the operation of the conscience clause that would be likely to induce the bishops to change their minds?

—Conscience clause is an ambiguous term. It may mean something very innocent, or it may mean something that may affect the whole teaching of the school. I think many people feel a dread of it on the second ground, for fear, for instance, that under cover of a conscience clause interference should take place with the management of our schools. I will mention a very striking instance, which I would regard as an interference of the gravest kind, and which I am quite convinced they never would endure. All our schools (I think I may say all, for we have continual requests made to us to give the present to our schools) possess an image of the Blessed Virgin. I think the Catholic bishops of England, and every Catholic too, would consider it a positive outrage to be prevented having such an image in their schools. There are various little acts of devotion practised during the day at the beginning of each hour, very often a slight prayer is offered, probably a *Hail Mary*. They would consider interference with such a thing as that as a violation of the whole order and discipline of their school. I think nothing would induce them to submit to it. I think there is a dread that under cover of a conscience clause such interference would be brought about—so far as that I am, I think, free to say there would be great deal of a conscience clause under which that could be done, but not such a conscience clause as is mentioned in what I have read, and which is just and equitable.

25425. If after the Catholic bishops approved in 1847 of a conscience clause, it had been introduced, and if it was found in 1869 that grave members arose from the operation in the schools, do you not conceive that the Catholic bishops would be free to change their minds?—Yes.

25426. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Would they be willing to have the religious exercises conducted at the opening of the school, and allow Protestant children to come in at the close of the exercises?—I would imagine that would come under the original conscience clause, which they stated to be just. The question is a little ambiguous, for I don't know whether any subsequent devotion might take place, as, for instance, at the beginning of each hour.

25427. Do you think they would not be willing to forego such acts of devotion?—I think not.

25428. Mr. Gibson.—What is the character of the history taught in your schools?—Perhaps I had better read from the statement of the "Catholic Institute," from which I before quoted a passage that will be an answer to that question, and which comes from authority—

"Beside this the committee beg once more to state that the prevailing principle of all instruction in Roman Catholic schools is religion, and also according to the expressed desire of His Majesty's Government of the instruction is all other subjects taught by the State; and while in other cases religious tenets of the parties are carefully and justly respected by Her Majesty's Government, the committee confidently appeal against the dangerous injustice which would be inflicted upon Roman Catholic schools by refusing them a similar protection, especially as the numerous common-sense points of religion and history in this regard would make an examination in the one almost inseparably involve the consideration of the other. With regard to the very first introduction of Christianity into this kingdom, questions might arise that would involve religious controversy. The character of the earliest sovereigns of this kingdom, and of the Catholic Church in this realm, are subjects of dispute between Catholic and Protestant historians. The contest between Henry II. and St. Thomas of Canterbury, which to the

Catholic constitutes the violence and tyranny of the former and the holy martyrdom of the latter, could hardly be introduced by an Inspector who might be the advocate of Protestant history without direct or incidental violence to the historical tradition of the Catholic. The character and the events of the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary and Elizabeth, which are so prominent in the history of this country, and so interwoven in their consequences with every succeeding reign, could not be treated upon by a Protestant Inspector of Roman Catholic schools without trifling on the conscientious opinions of Roman Catholics."

Feb. 25, 1869.  
Thomas W.  
Alford, Esq.,  
Jurat.

In introduction of that I may add that the examination papers contain questions on the very points mentioned.

25429. What are the text books you use for the teaching of history?—We use different text books.

25430. Mr. Stokes.—Are not the managers of schools free to choose their own books?—Certainly. Therefore the Poor School Committee would hardly be called upon to name any text books as the books they use. The managers are free to choose their own books.

25431. Mr. Gibson.—I do not refer to authorized books, but to any books that are in use?—As my committee does not enjoin the use of any particular text books I could not say any books.

25432. I do not ask what books they enjoin, but what books they use?—That is more than I can answer, for each school has full permission to use any books the managers like.

25433. Are there any historical works on English or Irish history in use in the schools?—No doubt there are many such books, but it belongs to managers of schools to use them as they like.

25434. Can you not name any one book in use?—I don't think it expedient to do so, because my committee have nothing to do with the appointment of such books.

25435. Does such a matter as that not come within your knowledge?—It comes with the individual managers of schools. We have a perfect guarantee that the books used shall be the right books, because it involves the question of religion, and in such cases the religious instruction is directed by the parent, and the priest is under the bishop. The Poor School Committee has the fullest guarantee, but does not interfere.

25436. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You are not asked as representing your committee to name any books, but school, as a gentleman acquainted with the fact, what history or histories may be used in Roman Catholic schools in England?—I answer they have full liberty to use any they like.

25437. None any?—I would rather not name any.

25438. Do you know?—I know that they use various books, but they are not restricted to any particular books. There are, for instance, the Christian Brothers' books, they may use them if they like, they are not obliged.

25439. Do you know the names of any histories in use?—It does not belong to me, as secretary of the Catholic Poor School Committee, to answer that, because we leave the managers of the different schools entirely free on the subject.

25440. Sir Robert Kane.—What are the examination questions you speak of?—Questions proposed to candidates for admission into normal schools and questions proposed to students in normal schools and issued by the Privy Council each year.

25441. Are students in Catholic training schools expected to answer these questions?—Yes.

25442. Are some of these questions on historical subjects such as you referred to in your former answer?—Yes, they are.

25443. Are they expected to be answered in a manner which would be disagreeable to Roman Catholics?—No doubt it is expected they should be answered in conformity with Catholic principles, and, consequently, I imagine the answers to these same questions on the part of Catholic students and Protestants would be very often diametrically opposite to each other.

25444. Not as to matter of fact?—As to matter of fact equally. For instance, whether St. Thomas of Canterbury was a martyr, or whether he was a rebel. That seems to me to be matter of fact entirely.

Feb. 16, 1869.  
 Thomas W.  
 Allen, Esq.,  
 &c.

25445. The *Chorists*.—Who inspect your two training schools?—The three Catholic Government Inspectors, as they are appointed by the Privy Council.

25446. The *maire* who inspect ordinary schools?—Yes.

25447. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Are you not aware those questions in history which you have been speaking of are in fact drawn up by me, after consultation with Mr. Stokes?—I am happy to say I was not aware of the fact.

25448. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You said that all the members of your Catholic Poor School Committee are nominated by the bishops of their respective districts?—Yes.

25449. So that they represent them?—Yes.  
 25450. They are absolutely chosen by them?—Yes. They are nominated by them.

25451. Why not leave the choice to the Catholic people?—Simply that the Catholic Poor School Committee was not so appointed originally.

25452. Would there be any unwillingness now on the part of the bishops to allow a fair representation of the laity on the committee?—They would say the Catholic Poor School Committee was intended to represent the whole diocese, and that the bishop forms the most important part of the diocese—the ruler of it, in fact, by divine institution.

25453. You said they were removable for other causes. What are the other reasons? For instance, or that they served many years, or that they thought they had served long enough, or as it may suit their convenience.

25454. In fact the committee is so chosen by the bishops that it does their work, and as they wish?—I don't understand quite what is "their work." It does the work of their dioceses.

25455. In the matter of education?—Then work, if so understood, would be to represent the whole Catholic body, both clerical and lay, in the matter of primary education; and therefore they leave the members of the committee in full freedom to do that, and especially the lay members, who are two to one.

25456. But these two to one, they are equally appointed on the direction of the bishop, with the *clergyman*?—But with full power.

25457. Is that so?—I am admitting that, but with full power to act as they think best.

25458. Have not the clergy who are on the committee also a similar power to act as they think best?—Certainly.

25459. So that in that respect there is no difference between them?—No difference.

25460. In connection with the minute of Council to which you have referred, you said no salary is given to any teacher who is in holy orders, except in training schools?—Yes.

25461. Do you not then occupy a much more favourable position than any other religious denomination in that matter?—I don't understand in what respect.

25462. Are religious teachers in holy orders in any sense?—Not at all.

25463. I wish again to know whether you, in connection with your schools, occupy a superior position to that of the Established Church, or the Non-Confessional bodies in England?—By no means; exactly the same. In one respect there is a difference, and I think it is the only one. All the religious bodies—Presbyterians, Catholics, Jews, and Anglicans—possess equally the right of veto on the appointments of Inspectors, but the Established Church has a right, I believe, to remove them. I know it well, and I think the right countries. I think the Archbishops of Canterbury and York can request the removal of Inspectors in their provinces. No such power exists on the part of the other religious bodies, I think. Certainly no such power exists with regard to Catholics.

25464. Are deacons in the Established Church

supposed to be in holy orders?—And in the Catholic Church.

25465. To what order do they belong?—To the deacons. As deacons, they are in holy orders.

25466. Are you aware deacons are not allowed to teach in the Church of England schools?—Neither would they be allowed to teach in the Catholic schools.

25467. Are you aware that local or lay preachers—persons not in orders—are not allowed to teach in schools?—I was not aware of that, but that seems perfectly just, because they stand on the same footing with ministers generally.

25468. How can they stand on the same footing, when they are not in orders?—Because deacons have no orders.

25469. Are you not aware there is a distinction made between ordained ministers, in non-conformist bodies, and local or lay preachers, and that that distinction is recognised by the Privy Council?—I was not aware.

25470. Are you aware then when the English system was in process of formation, the Bishop of Eborac wished to employ as teachers some inferior order of the clergy?—No.

25471. And that the statement of the day saw this would come to employing State money in training clergy, and providing means of doctrinal propaganda?—I was not aware of that.

25472. And consequently rules were framed that the teachers should be laymen in the fullest sense of the term?—That is entirely carried out with regard to Catholics.

25473. And that though this bore hard upon the Methodists, nevertheless they were so convinced of its wisdom that they cheerfully acquiesced in it?—I know nothing about that.

25474. With regard to the correspondence of which you were speaking, which referred to Roman Catholic claims as involving a right to frame regulations for the religious and moral training connected with their schools, what opposition was given to that?—I think there was no opposition to the religious and moral training. I think you have misread "moral."

25475. I think you read the word?—I said the "religious" I think.

25476. In reference to the correspondence you mentioned?—I think so.

25477. You spoke of the Catholic bishops framing regulations for the religious and moral training of the children?—If that is said in it, I have no objection to it. There was a discussion about the word "moral," but I don't think it necessary to go into that, I don't think that is the scope of the question.

25478. In connection with the training establishments you said the teachers may be, or have been, sometimes Christian Brothers, were they recognised as such?—They did not come before the Privy Council in the position of Christian Brothers, but as teachers.

25479. Did the Christian Brothers exercise any control over the training establishments, or were they employed as servants?—If a Christian Brother were a teacher in a training school, he would act as teacher, and have whatever authority belonged to him as teacher—simply that.

25480. I presume you would be very happy to have a training school, managed by Christian Brothers, and give them absolute control of it?—Absolutely—certainly not, because every such institution must be under the Bishop.

25481. Sir Robert Kane.—Have the Christian Brothers in England come into connection with the Privy Council?—Is it meant the Irish Christian Brothers or any Christian Brother?

25482. Any association of Christian Brothers?—There are two associations of Christian Brothers in England, that have come into connection with the Privy Council as teachers, the Xaverian Brothers are one, and the Marists are the other. There are not many of either.

25483. Are there branches of the French Christian Brothers?—They are also in England, but not teaching those schools.

25484. Mr. Stokes.—Have they not made attempts to get themselves in connexion with the Privy Council?—I believe they did, but they do not manage any poor schools, I think.

25485. Do you remember that two of these brothers while teaching a poor school at Wolverhampton attended an examination and simply upon their failure to pass the examination satisfactorily, they gave up the school?—I do not.

25486. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are Christian Brothers generally employed in teaching in the poor schools in England?—There are Xaverian Brothers and Marists, about twelve of each order.

25487. Lord Chelmsford.—Is there any connexion between the English and Irish Christian Brothers? Are they the same communities?—Christian Brothers is no general phrase.

25488. Are they members of the one order?—No.

25489. Have the Irish Christian Brothers got any schools in England?—Some.

25490. Have they received aid from the Privy Council?—No, they refused.

25491. Mr. Dyke.—Are you aware on what grounds?—I am not.

25492. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Your schools are altogether denominational?—Certainly.

25493. Do you think many Protestant children attend the schools?—I should think not.

25494. Is there much actual proselytism going on as the result of the attendance?—That I am quite unable to say.

25495. Is there any effort whatever made in the schools to protect those children from proselytism?—I have no doubt they might withdraw if they desired to do so, from religious instruction.

25496. But only from direct religious instruction?—They could not withdraw from the rest, for it is infused through the whole teaching.

25497. In fact they get the full benefit of the religious teaching of the school?—I should think they did.

25498. Now, how could they possibly escape the religious teaching of the school when the books are so denominational?—I am not prepared to say that no books are used in the school which are not denominational. There may be scientific books.

25499. Are not the ordinary reading books, used in conveying instruction, largely interwoven with religious dogma?—Well, as I said before, we don't authorize any particular books, therefore, as the secretary of my committee, I need not answer the question.

25500. As a matter of fact?—I should think they were.

25501. How will a conscience clause protect children of a different denomination, where the books contain religious dogma, and all the children are instructed in them?—But as our schools are intended to be denominational, we have not the difficulty before us.

25502. Will a conscience clause apply for the protection of the children in your schools?—In the same way that it would apply in any other schools, for religious dogma runs equally through all other reading books.

25503. Will you please say whether, in your opinion, a conscience clause in connexion with your schools, considering the books used, could fully and fairly protect Protestant children?—I can hardly enter into such a subject. It would protect them as much as such a conscience clause would protect in any other schools; as much and no more it seems to me.

25504. So, Mr. Dyke.—Am I right in supposing it to be your meaning, that so long as a school is denominational—as long as the system of education is based upon a denominational idea—that the school belongs to a certain religious body, and is the natural vehicle for the inculcation of their religious feeling—that although a conscience clause may enable a child to abstain himself from the dogmatic teaching in education or formalities at certain hours, it cannot free him from the general influence of the element of religious teaching that permeates the whole of the teaching. Am I right in supposing that to be your

meaning?—With this further statement, that if the schools were undenominational, the same thing would exist—that the teaching which would run all through the books would be undenominational dogmatic, that is anti-dogmatic, which is as strongly dogmatic in a certain sense, as the dogmatic itself. That which is negative has something in it as positive as that which is in its own nature positive. If you are to have a school into which religion is not to enter, the whole teaching of that school would be penetrated by anti-religious element.

25505. You consider that the absence of religious teaching necessarily involves irreligious teaching?—It involves anti-religious teaching more than irreligious. A school constructed on what is called the unsectarian principle, would be, in fact, anti-Catholic in the highest possible degree. No greater tyranny could be exercised than requiring Catholic children to attend such a school, although it were proved nothing but was contrary to Catholicity, for, in fact, the whole structure of the school from beginning to end, would be intensely anti-Catholic.

25506. Lord Chelmsford.—Your opinion goes to this extent, that it is impossible to separate secular from religious instruction?—Quite so, because the supposed secular education will be, in a certain sense, religious. It will convey that as a negative or anti-religious system.

25507. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—So that in your opinion non-dogmatic teaching is equivalent to strict dogmatic teaching?—Not equivalent, but non-dogmatic teaching is in the true sense dogmatic, for the very dogma is the not teaching dogma, a dogma of the most powerful kind.

25508. Have you not said already the object of a conscience clause is to protect religious convictions?—I should not myself accept that as an equivalent definition of a conscience clause. It is a partial one. It would be rather, I should think, that in a country so divided as we are, as much justice should be done to the different religious convictions as can be done without injuring the religious character of the school.

25509. What is the object of the conscience clause?—What I have just stated.

25510. What, in your opinion, is the object of a conscience clause?—That which I have just stated.

25511. Will you state it more simply?—I don't think I can.

25512. Would the Roman Catholic bishops of Great Britain be willing to eliminate religious dogma from the books in use in their schools that a conscience clause could fully and fairly operate?—They have not instructed me to answer that.

25513. What is your opinion?—I cannot give any opinion.

25514. Sir Robert Kane.—Does it substantially come to this, that so long as the denominational system is preserved in its integrity—such as that there should be full liberty for the exposition of opinions of religion and for having a thread of religion running through the substance of the general instruction, that a conscience clause cannot be a really practical and sufficient protection for the religious faith of the children not belonging to the denomination of the school?—I should not like to say so much as that. I think really and truly a Protestant child might attend a Catholic school and learn in it all the secular part of education and leave the school calmly unconcerned. I think that is quite possible. I think it may have happened. And on the other hand I think a Catholic child makes the guardianship of such a conscience clause as we were speaking of, the original conscience clause, might attend a Protestant school, derive secular instruction from it, and might retain its faith. I think that quite possible.

25515. But looking to the powerful action of those religious influences which enter so largely as you state into the teaching of the secular subjects, would you consider it probable that a Protestant child after having spent three or four years receiving instruction in such a school, would be likely to leave that school with

Feb. 16, 1869.

Thomas W. Allen, esq.,  
M.P.

Feb. 18, 1893.

Thomas W.  
Allen, esq.,  
&c.

his Protestant convictions?—I should be very unwilling, as a general principle, that Catholic children should be unable to attend any other but Protestant schools, even under the protection of a conscience clause. I think their attendance would be injurious to them. I think they might escape having their religious convictions altered. I think it undesirable that a Catholic child should be exposed to the general teaching of an anti-Catholic school, even under the protection of a conscience clause; but it would be better for the child who did attend a Protestant school to have such a conscience clause than to be without one.

25516. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Your English system is denominational strictly?—Yes.

25517. The Irish system is a different one?—Yes.

25518. And has in each of its schools a conscience clause? Are you aware of that?—I am aware the Irish system is quite different from the English.

25519. Do you know the proportion of local support from school fees and otherwise, necessary for the Government grant for education in Ireland?—No.

25520. Are you not aware the State gives a very large subsidy?—I am.

25521. Much larger than in England?—Much larger.

25522. Does not the local support in England form about three-fourths of the sum paid for education, and the State portion about one-fourth?—I think that is not a correct statement, not strictly correct.

25523. I shall take an accurate statement from you?—In the year 1897, for instance, for the Catholic schools, £31,694 were granted by the Government in a total of £55,842.

25524. Do the Catholic schools contribute as largely as the schools of other denominations?—I have not considered that particularly. I have restrained myself to considering the case of our own Catholic schools.

25525. You are not aware of that as a fact?—I am neither aware nor unaware.

25526. Would not the extension of the English system to Ireland involve the principle that the parties demanding it should raise a much larger sum of money than they do raise now to support the schools?—I think not.

25527. Do you consider that there is any analogy between England and Ireland in the matter of education?—The very direct.

25528. Do not the bishops who make the demand for denominational education here represent a much less amount of voluntary and self sacrifice for education than you in England do?—I am unable to answer questions respecting the condition of Ireland.

25529. Is not the demand in reality that the bishops should have the control of education in this country?—I wish to answer no question respecting the condition of things in Ireland. I am not called upon, it seems to me, to go into that point.

25530. Mr. Sullivan.—You are not practically acquainted with the condition of education here?—Only as any ordinary observer may be. I am not specially acquainted with it.

25531. Are you prepared to enter into statistical details as to how much is contributed by local parties in Ireland for education?—Certainly not.

25532. Mr. Gibson.—Have you any acquaintance with lesson books of our Irish Board of National Education?—I have no special acquaintance with them. Not such an acquaintance as that I should like to supply information about them.

25533. It was said no history was taught in our schools. I have in my hands the Fifth Book of Lessons dated 1892, in which from page 83, and other parts to page 210, is a compendium of history, ancient and modern. You are not acquainted with these details?—Not specially acquainted.

25534. Mr. Deane.—You mentioned that a certain number of Irish National teachers had gone over to England, and had been employed in schools there. They have been examined and become certificated teachers in England?—Yes.

25535. Have you generally found in these cases that

they had been satisfactorily trained?—I don't think I could answer that. I have not sufficient information to answer that. I may mention that one of our teachers in the training school at Hammersmith was an Irish teacher who came over.

25536. Have you known any, and if so, how many instances of classified Irish National school teachers having failed to obtain certificates in England?—I don't know. I have not particularly noted the matter.

25537. You mentioned that the training school at Liverpool is under the direction of a religious order. Are they a teaching order exclusively, or do they visit the sick poor?—A teaching order.

25538. Have you met with many instances in England of Roman Catholic children attending non-Catholic schools?—I know there are a great many such instances, certainly. I have heard of them chiefly. I think, through inspectors of schools, saying that they have gone into Protestant institutions and found a vast number of children with Catholic names, and who were originally Catholics.

25539. Did that occur in districts where Catholic schools were available for them?—In London it exists very largely.

25540. Where Protestant children attend in your Catholic schools would they make a conscience clause be absolutely excluded from religious instruction?—We have no conscience clause.

25541. Do you happen to know the practice in the Tolson school where such a clause exists?—The practice in such a case is left to individual managers entirely, but my notion is they would never compel a child to receive religious instruction against his will. I speak generally. I don't know anything with regard to that particular school.

25542. Have you ever met with an instance of a Catholic teacher, in a Catholic school, giving Catholic religious instruction to a non-Catholic pupil by the desire of the parent?—I think I have come incidentally across such things. It has been asked at our Board, for instance. You mention, here, certain Protestant children attending.

25543. Do the parents send them willingly?—Oh, entirely so.

25544. Have you ever met with an instance of a Catholic teacher giving Protestant religious instruction to a Protestant child, by the desire of the parent?—I cannot say that I have.

25545. Would you consider that a very objectionable thing to take place?—I would think it next door to questioning from his own religion.

25546. Would you be astonished to hear of such things occurring in this country?—I should not be astonished at anything.

25547. What is the course pursued in the examination of nuns, for certificates of their fitness to be teachers?—They meet with exactly the same examination as the other candidates for outsiders. They attend the same examination, and receive the same papers.

25548. Could you tell the Commissioners what is the course pursued in the examination of teachers for certificates?—Teachers are examined for certificates at the Christmas examination, once in the year. They go to the training school where the examination is held. They receive papers for a certain number of days, twice a day, from the inspectors of schools. These papers are sent to the Privy Council, immediately after they are answered, and the award is based upon the results of these papers.

25549. The examination continues for some days?—Yes.

25550. Where are the examinations held generally?—At the training school.

25551. Where would the nuns go to be examined for certificates?—The nuns would go to Liverpool, and the Sisters of Notre Dame, in case they are nuns, receive them into their home during the examination. They have a large house there, therefore, during the examination, the nuns would be in the convent of Notre Dame, at Liverpool. I should also say, that in



use the nuns wished to go elsewhere, they would have the same rights as other candidates; that is, candidates may be examined at training schools of a different denomination nearer to them than their own, in order to save a long journey. Suppose there were, for instance, nuns in Edinburgh, they would say,—"It is a hardship to us to be obliged to go to Liverpool. Can we be examined at the Protestant training school in Edinburgh?" That has been allowed with regard to other candidates. Of course, it might be, with regard to the nuns. If nuns had a house in Edinburgh or Glasgow, and wished to avoid the journey to Liverpool, they might attend for examination at a Protestant or dissenting training school near to them, and receive the same examination as the other teachers. The Inspector in that case would not be a Catholic, but a Protestant. As the papers all go up to London, it does not so much matter. It is at the option of the teachers to do that if they like.

25532. Have you heard of any objection having been made by any orders of nuns in England, to undergoing the examination?—With regard to that, a great number of different orders have received the examination, that is considering the public service they would render in being certificated teachers; they have accepted the condition of the examination. I suppose, in no case can it be agreeable to a religious to come to an examination held by seculars, but one order after another has accepted it. I think there are some who still stand out against it. There are no nuns, who, on a matter of principle, say they cannot do it. The fact that some have accepted it would determine that question, but I have no doubt that, by far the greater number of the orders have accepted it as a penance, as a thing done for the greater glory of God. It is not the thing they would choose.

25533. Are they examined in the same room with the non-religious teachers? Is there a strict examination?—Yes, there is a reading.

25534. Is there a passage in your last report bearing on the question of the examination of nuns?—There are two passages respecting it, both of which I should like to read. There is the following passage:—

"In addition to the teachers—male and female—who have been trained and sent forth to teach, a considerable number of nuns and mistresses have qualified themselves for teaching in schools under Government inspection, by passing an examination for the certificate. Especially it is to be noted, that a great number of our female religious have done this. Among our certificated mistresses are comprehended wives of almost every rank. Nor is there anything in the examination to deter any competent teacher from approaching it."

25535. Is there any other passage bearing upon that subject?—There is a passage bearing upon the point produced. It is as follows:—

"Then, the Catholic body has, at a very slight cost indeed of annual maintenance, procured the training of a large supply of female teachers to the present time. St. Lawrence's having contributed approximately 100 trained teachers, trained for this service at the end of 1862. The Liverpool Training School, since 1856 has sent out 527 trained school-mistresses, of whom 274 are now engaged as teachers in Great Britain and the Colonies. Birmingham alone has contributed in 1864, has received into training 136 nuns, of whom about 124 are known to be acting as mistresses of elementary schools in Great Britain. Thus, a number of about 600 men and women have been trained as teachers in normal schools since the Committee began its work. They have obtained from general public examinations, held by the authority of Government, incommensurate certificates of efficiency. No one who does not dispute the very elementary proposition, that there is an art of teaching which it is important to communicate to those who are to be themselves teachers, will doubt that the efficiency of teaching in elementary Catholic schools has been greatly improved by the creation of such a body, while the National standard of secular education, set by the Privy Council Minister, has been attained, the Church has been at the fellow thirty, without loss of hierarchy, to lessen that education with her own divine principles. There has been no coexistence class, no forbidding of given things, nor of the whole education of Catholic worship in the order of the school; the teachers,

the Inspectors, and the managers, have been exclusively Catholic. It is perceived that no age or country has witnessed a system of more perfect liberty than this has been; the basis of which was laid by the long continued conference of the Committee with the Committee of Council, and its charter, expressed in the minutes of Council, of 18th December, 1857."

Vol. 18, 1868.  
Thomas W.  
Allen, esq.,  
&c.

25536. The inspection under the English system is altogether denominational?—Yes.

25537. Would the English Catholic body think it a hardship to have to accept inspection of their schools by persons who were not Catholic?—They would refuse the thing altogether.

25538. Sir Robert Ross.—Is the inspection of schools limited to secular subjects?—Yes.

25539. It does not include any religious subject. Then on what ground do you consider the denominational character of the inspection is necessary, and that you say the Catholic body would refuse altogether any change in that regard?—It was one of the general heads under which they answered in the letter preceding the formation of my Committee, but which answer was by the authority of the bishops. Part of that letter I have quoted, and this is one of the points dwelt upon in that letter. The sixth principle laid down by Lord John Russell was that the Catholic Institute, which preceded my Committee, was to have the power of appealing against the appointment of an Inspector of Roman Catholic schools, without his name being submitted for their acceptance; therefore they gave the answer, part of which has been read on another subject. The Committee state that they cannot comply, unless the Inspector be a Roman Catholic, and approved of by them, and they go on to submit their reasons for that; first, because the other great religious communities, the Church of England, especially, have the same right. They also say they could not possibly allow an Inspector, who was not a Catholic, inasmuch as that Inspector would be called upon to ask questions which involve religion and history, and history was quoted as being a special subject on which that difficulty would come out more clearly and distinctly than in any other subject. They, therefore, made the statement with regard to Saint Thomas of Canterbury. On no consideration would it be allowed for an Inspector, not a Catholic, to superintend even the secular instruction in the schools, because by a first principle of the Catholic religion the two instructions cannot be separated. They must run into each other.

25540. Do you consider that in a denominational school, secular and religious instruction cannot really be separated?—Not only in a denominational, but in any school they cannot.

25541. *A fortiori* in a denominational school, and that consequently, an Inspector could not limit himself to absolutely to secular subjects, so that he could be received in a school of a different denomination?—Clearly not, because to take, for instance, what has been mentioned, if he were examining children on the subject of the twelfth century, it is clear he must leave out the whole of the content between the Church and the State in that century, in order not to offend religious feelings on one side or the other. If he speaks of Saint Thomas in any way as a rebel, he must offend the Catholics, and if he speaks of him in another way he must offend the Protestants. He cannot be neutral. He must leave out the whole subject.

25542. Is it your opinion that the denominational system of education necessarily involves denominational inspection?—Yes.

25543. These Inspectors you mentioned are appointed by the Crown, subject to the approval of the Roman Catholic bishops?—Of the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee, which in that respect, no doubt, consults the bishops always.

25544. Then if any of these Inspectors by his conduct or opinions incur the disapproval of the Catholic Poor School Committee, he could not be retained as an Inspector?—That is a question which happily has

Feb. 15, 1880.

Thomas W  
Allen, O.C.,  
R.S.

never yet arisen. I have no doubt that if ground of offence arose the Poor School Committee would be called upon to act, that they would make representations to the Committee of Council. I make no doubt also the Committee of Council would enter into the matter and determine as they thought fit. I have no doubt the Committee of Council would recognise the Poor School Committee's action in such a case. As they had a veto upon the appointment, so they likewise had a right to renege it; at any rate in case they considered the appointment was not carried out in the spirit in which it was agreed to by them.

25565. Mr. Stokes.—Do you recollect the conditions of appointment attaching to the Church of England Inspectors?—I believe I mentioned before in answer to another question that they differ in that respect from the Catholics, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury and York had the power to demand the removal of an Inspector in their respective provinces.

25566. Do you recollect that the Catholic Poor School Committee demanded from the Privy Council a similar right, and that the Privy Council refused to accede to it, promising, however, to consider any representations made to them unfavourable to Inspectors?—I remember that.

25567. Sir Robert Kane.—Do you not consider that in any system of public education the Roman Catholic body is entitled to possess all the powers and privileges which any other religious community in the country possess?—Yes, certainly, but if, for instance, the Established Church makes to the State certain grants, I think that in recompense it may have certain powers given to it, which would not be given to any religious community which did not make the same concessions, for instance, if the Established Church allows the Inspectors appointed by the Government to examine its religious, that is a concession on its part for which it may claim to a certain degree such right as this of demanding the removal of the Inspectors. We should have the same rights, but we do not make the same concessions, for our Inspectors are not allowed to interfere with religious instruction at all. It does not seem to be unjust that in that respect the Poor School Committee should not have the right to demand the removal of the Inspector.

25568. Substantially then the position of the Catholic Poor School Committee is, that they could control the appointment and removal of the Inspectors?—Well, it is a little too much to say the latter. They could renege it to save any act of injustice, or wrong was committed by the Inspector, and I have no doubt they would be listened to.

25569. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should we understand you to say that the English system gives to Protestant non-conformists the right of having Inspectors of their own denomination for their schools?—Certainly, as a matter of fact it is so.

25570. Mr. Dease.—In reference to a matter about which you were examined by another Commissioner, I wish to ask you whether in your opinion the State, because it gives a larger amount of support for education in Ireland than it gives in England, would be justified in insisting upon having education in Ireland conducted in a manner repugnant to the religious feelings of the majority of the population?—It seems to me the proportion of the amount given by the State has nothing whatever to do with the matter. I don't see that the State would be in the least authorised to interfere with the rights of conscience in any sort of way because it gives a grant even of the whole amount.

25571. Mr. Sullivan.—How does your committee come in contact with the different managers of schools?—Part of our business is to make them building grants and support grants. A certain number of managers, therefore, everywhere ask us to give them grants to build new schools. A certain number likewise ask us to give them grants to support schools. Those applications bring us everywhere into immediate communication with a certain number of managers. We likewise receive—at least we ought to receive, and do receive from the vast majority of our schools an

annual collection which forms part of our fund, besides the private subscriptions, we are, therefore, in that way connected with every single Catholic school in Great Britain, except those in one Northern diocese which does not belong to us. The manager of each school has a right to correspond with us, and to ask us to undertake any matter of difficulty between him and the Privy Council. If a manager considers that a difficulty has arisen involving principle, he would naturally write to us saying, "this sort of thing has happened, it seems to me a principle is involved, and I wish you to take it up and present it to the Privy Council." This we do, or in case of any difficulty with reference to the grant, managers constantly write to us, and say, "What would you advise me to do, or would you see the Secretary of the Committee of Council respecting this?"

25572. The managers of the schools are I suppose generally clergymen?—Yes, and the chiefity. There is a committee of management in the case of every school for which the Privy Council made a building grant. There must be a committee on which laymen as well as clergymen.

25573. How are the laymen chosen?—There are regulations for their appointment.

25574. They are appointed when a building grant is made?—Yes, and there are regulations for the appointment of their successors who may be appointed by subscribers in some cases, in other cases the bishop directs the appointment, as where there are vacancies or the failure of original members.

25575. Are these committees of management in the case of schools to which no building grants have been made?—That entirely depends on the principal manager. It is a thing we don't interfere with at all. There are schools, for instance, I take it in which the managers, except for the religious part of the school, are laymen, schools that are supported by laymen entirely.

25576. Have you found your communications with schools where there are local committees satisfactory?—Yes.

25577. As a general rule is there any objection on the part of the bishops of England to have such local committees associated with them in managing schools?—No, of course individual bishops more or less incline to that, but as a rule they never refuse.

25578. Mr. Stokes.—I think you have said that the concordat between the Privy Council and your committee has worked generally with perfect harmony?—Yes.

25579. Have the terms upon which building grants are offered to Catholic promoters of new schools been generally accepted?—I should mention one condition of them, which I think is the only instance I know of in which fairness has not been done to Catholics. We have more than once thought of renegeing about it, but the circumstances were not favourable, and so we desisted. There is undoubtedly one condition which I consider very unfair indeed, it is this, all grants made by the Committee of Council for building, improving, enlarging, and fitting up day schools, are not to exceed the amount voluntarily contributed by residents within a radius of five miles from the school. Now such a condition is extremely fair in ordinary cases, and more especially in the case of the Established Church, for it may be naturally considered that if a school is wanted in any particular district the residents would be the best persons who are to judge of that, and their acts would show whether such a school was wanted. The very reverse is the case with us. We may have a poor emigrant Irish population in a manufacturing district in which the leading manufacturers are exclusively Protestant, perhaps themselves having sought for a system of schools of their own, and even engaging them people to send their children to such schools. A priest is appointed to such a station, and he finds several hundred Catholic children either going to no school, or to Protestant schools, the parents being obliged in some cases, especially in Scotland, to pay something to the support of a school which does not belong to their own religion. The priest says

"this is a great grievance. My children are being perverted, I must set up a school." He sets to the work, and he finds not a single Catholic about him of perhaps a higher position than a manual labourer. Now this rule of the Privy Council seems to me to come in for the very purpose of preventing such a man raising a school in such a district; but what he is obliged to do in many cases, is to go about himself and beg for the school, while the residents of whom the Privy Council's rules speak, are in the case of the Catholic population so poor, that they contribute very little to the building of the school. The school is most of all wanted in that particular district; but the operation of the rule issues by so much the amount that would be otherwise given to the Catholic applicants.

25599. Has no way of avoiding that difficulty presented itself to your mind?—Yes, and I have suggested it. I have suggested that the clergyman who begs for the schools should beg for them under this condition. He should say to the contributor, "I want what I am asking you for to build schools in my district; but if you give a contribution, let it be on the condition that I may present it as my own subscription for the purpose." I don't see anything wrong in that, and I don't know whether it has been done or not.

25600. Are not the collections made in the church or the chapel regarded as so much locally contributed?—Certainly.

25601. Would it not be in the power of a person wishing to advance a scheme of that kind to send subscriptions to a resident, with directions to put it on the plate?—Certainly; that has not occurred to me.

25602. Can you say how many Catholic schools in Great Britain have taken building grants?—Sixty-four in the end of 1867. I don't think there is one in the year 1868.

25603. Do you consider that a fair proportion?—I consider it most miserable. This is referred to in the last report of the Poor School Committee, one of whose purposes is to make grants for the building of schools I read from the report:—

"The fact is notorious that whereas the committee have paid 122 grants for building schools, all building grants paid to Catholic schools by the Privy Council reach only to the number *twenty-four* down to the end of the year 1867. Not only is this the case, but the last ten years present the following scale of distribution:—

\* BUILDING GRANTS RECEIVED BY CATHOLIC SCHOOLS FROM THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Number of Schools.	Grants granted.	£	s.	d.
1838, . . . 10	10,569	15	5	—
1839, . . . 6	6,986	0	0	—
1840, . . . 7	4,100	0	0	—
1841, . . . 10	3,864	8	0	—
1842, . . . 2	360	10	0	—
1843, . . . 1	475	0	0	—
1844, . . . 1	835	4	0	—
1845, . . . 1	334	11	2	—
1846, . . . —	—	—	—	—
1847, . . . —	—	—	—	—

"Then it appears that in 1866 and 1867 this Committee have paid thirty-six building grants, while no Catholic school has received a Privy Council building grant. But the small extent to which we have assisted ourselves of this grant is best shown by comparison with another community, whose whole annual grant is about equal to our own. The Wesleyans, down to the end of 1866, had received in building grants £76,951 19s. 10d., Catholics £30,549 4s. 3d."

In 1866 the Grant disappeared altogether, so that hardly more than one-fifth of the schools built have received the Privy Council building grant.

25605. Do you think that the small number of grants is attributable to the small rate we aid, or to a reluctance on the part of Catholics to accept the terms of that grant?—I think both, because at the same time that there has been a very large reduction of the Catholic applications, there has been also a reduction in the number of Protestant applications. There have been various causes tending to produce this result. With regard to ourselves poverty has been at the bottom of most of the difficulties, for instance there has

been an impression prevailing that the Privy Council require too expensive a sort of school. I know one bishop who says "there is no use in my applying for aid. I had better have a shed than no school at all, and the Privy Council won't accept a poor building." That is a strong way of putting it. Many undoubtedly consider the Privy Council require a building of rather too expensive a character. That is one view, but there are other views also, and one thing which has operated unfavourably is a strong suspicion with reference to the control of the Privy Council. Some years ago certain authorities represented that the Model School Deed did put the school under the control of the Privy Council in such a way that it was calculated to take the property from the trustees. I think it may be said to have been proved that that suspicion was entirely unfounded. I don't think that the effect of that suspicion which was raised by a person of great capacity and influence was done away with; however, since then a great reduction in the number of applications has occurred, and I don't think that suspicion has been altogether got over. I think that at the present moment a great number of managers suppose the school deed does put the school in some way or other under the control of the Privy Council in an unavoidable manner. I believe the suspicion is entirely unfounded, and that if they would read and study the Model Deed, they would see that the only way in which there is any interference at all in this, that the trustees of the Model Deed have the power to sell the property, but they cannot exercise that power without the permission in writing of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and without his consent to the repayment of the sum allowed by the Privy Council. If it were wanted to build a superior school in a better situation, or if circumstances required the removal of an old school, permission must be obtained, but I have no doubt such a permission would be accorded. It is the sole point in which there is an infringement upon the rights of proprietorship, and, inasmuch as the condition is evidently pointed to secure the dedication of the school to the purposes for which it was built, and to the purposes for which the contributors contributed their money, it seems to me a most equitable provision. Notwithstanding that, however, the condition has to a certain degree created a prejudice in the minds of those who would make applications for grants. There is another view which may come under the head of poverty, but more remotely, that is, that no Privy Council building grant is paid without it being stated at the time of payment, that there is no demand for the building of that school, which would not be satisfied by the payment of the grant. Accordingly many of our schools being built by loans and such like, which are not paid off at the completion of the building, applicants are deterred from applying. That might come under the head of poverty. One more point operates, producing partly of applications, that is, that the power to accept a building grant has been left entirely optional with each manager, but I imagine that many of our managers do not go into the whole question of our connexion with the Privy Council, don't understand its bearings, and having a general prejudice very antipathetic against connexion with the Government in the first instance, determine against it, without having heard the reasons for or against the connexion, and without making themselves masters of the subject, for though our bishops have by common consent agreed that we could with perfect security take the building grant, as well as the annual grant, they have not gone so far as to say, we wish our clergy generally to accept one or the other.

25606. Would you say that practically the conditions of the Privy Council building grants are not such as to enable the poorer congregations of Catholics to supply themselves with schoolhouses by the aid of such grants?—Well, I think that at present they are not. Certainly the amount of aid given now in the case of small schools is not worth the trouble of applying for.

Feb. 16, 1868.

Thomas W.  
Aldrich, Esq.  
M.P.

Feb 18, 1869

Theodore W.  
Allen, esq.,  
M.A.

25587. Does not the Committee of Council make grants toward the erection of teachers' residences?—Yes, by a minute of the code.

25588. Have you watched the operation of that minute?—I have, but not to be able say what proportion of school managers have built school-houses for teachers. In many cases they have done so, and in many cases they have not.

25589. Can you say whether the addition of a house for the teacher has been found advantageous in the working of the school?—Certainly.

25590. What is the extent of the annual aid toward carrying on schools, which the Catholic schools of Great Britain draw from the Privy Council, including everything?—It is about £30,000 a year, it is rather more now, £31,316, to the 31st March, 1867, the last published account. For 1865, it was £29,846. They altered the year in 1866, so that I cannot well compare the one year with the other, but it may be stated generally now as being a little more than £31,000 a year.

25591. How are these total amounts distributed?—I find that out of the £31,316, £21,591 was given for the education of 55,842 children in England in the capitation grant, and £1,525 was given in Scotland. That would account for about £23,090. Then there would be the grants for the training schools. The proportionate expenses of the Central Board, which should be taken out of the grant, and there would be the building grant, if any. In this case there were none.

25592. To whom does the grant earned by a school go?—To the manager.

25593. Is the manager left free to distribute the grant for the use of the school to the best of his discretion?—With regard to teachers trained before 1863, he is bound to give them three times the amount of the certificate which they would have received under the old regulation of the Privy Council. With regard to the teachers trained since, he is free to make his own arrangements with them.

25594. Does the manager remain under any responsibility or accountability for the grant of public money which he receives?—Yes.

25595. Is he bound to keep school accounts?—Certainly.

25596. Must these accounts be audited?—Certainly.

25597. Do you consider that a wise arrangement?—I do, most wise.

25598. Your committee deal, I think you said, with all classes of primary schools throughout Great Britain—have you ever been led to compare the number of schools which are aided with those which remain unaided?—I have. I can give the number of schools aided. I find there were 645 schools, understanding by schools departments, which were receiving aid in Great Britain. I wished particularly to be able to give the number of unaided schools, but I can not give it accurately. That there must be a considerable number may, I think, be inferred from the fact that in the diocese of Westminster there were 130 schools, of which only fifty two received aid last year, and seventy eight did not receive aid. That proportion must be above the general proportion throughout the country, but it leads me to conjecture there is a considerable number of Catholic schools that do not receive aid.

25599. Can you offer any explanation why so large a number remain unaided?—One great reason is the last I assigned in a previous answer, for the not receiving building grants, and that is, that the receiving or not receiving grants is optional with every manager. There are other causes for it speaking strongly. For instance, members of poor parishes would gladly place schools under the Committee of Council if they saw it would not cost more—if they saw that the connection with the Privy Council, bringing with it the necessity of having a certificated teacher, would likewise bring with it such a grant from the Privy Council as would at least pay the additional cost, I am sure they would accept. There is a general dread, I think, that

they are not, perhaps, equal to it. There is a dread of what is unknown of the inspection, and of what is required under it, but I think poverty is largely at the bottom of the difficulty.

25600. Do you think the restriction of grants to schools taught by certificated teachers explains the number of schools which get no assistance?—I think it enters into it as a cause, but by no means explains it. We might have a larger number of teachers had there been a large demand.

25601. Do you think the maintenance of this restriction is wise?—I think it quite essential.

25602. You have been asked, with regard to religious teachers in schools—would you say that on the whole the Privy Council system treated them with fairness?—Religions, as distinguished from secular teachers, certainly.

25603. You would not think there was anything in the condition of their religious life to require them to be put upon a different footing from other teachers—any regulation which would necessitate an inquiry upon the part of the Government into their religious character?—Not at all.

25604. You gave a very decided opinion upon the necessity of maintaining denominational inspection?—Yes.

25605. Has that matter received your mature consideration?—I should say that such a matter has always been before me for the last fifteen years.

25606. Is it because you would regard the giving up denominational inspection as a concession of a privilege you now enjoy, that you would object to it?—No; on the essential ground that I don't think there can be a good school without it.

25607. Have you any acquaintance with the reformatory and industrial schools?—I do not visit them officially, therefore my acquaintance with them is not very special.

25608. Are you aware these schools are denominational schools?—Well, they are to a certain degree—not completely so, because they have not got a denominational inspection. Our reformatories are under the condition of receiving a Protestant Inspector.

25609. So far as the teachers and children go, are they not separate?—Yes.

25610. Are they not inspected by a common Inspector?—They are.

25611. Have you heard of any inconvenience that has arisen from that denominational inspection in the case of reformatory and industrial schools?—Well, there is considerable heart-burning about it—a dislike of the thing in itself—a dislike that the schools are not under the Privy Council but under the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary has never entered into the same sort of arrangement with the Catholic body that the Privy Council has entered into, therefore we are not authorized to interfere in the case of these schools, on the ground, I fancy, that those belonging to them are in a certain sense criminal classes, so that the State possesses over them an exceptional jurisdiction. But, undoubtedly, had we a sufficient number of Catholic reformatories to occupy the attention of an Inspector, we should ask for the appointment of a Catholic Inspector, whether we got it or not.

25612. Have you thought it necessary to ask for a denominational inspection in the case of these schools?—Some few years ago we were near doing so; I think the fact that we were not officially enabled to speak for churches over which the State possessed this exceptional jurisdiction stood in our way, and the fact that we had not a sufficient number of schools to occupy the whole time of an Inspector.

25613. Was not the denominational inspection here carried out by a Protestant clergyman?—No doubt.

25614. Can you say whether any considerable positive evil has resulted from the denominational inspection in those cases?—I certainly would not affirm it.

25615. Rev. Mr. Croft.—With regard to the denominational inspection in England, do you not think the State has conceded that point because in the Church of England schools, the Inspectors have to examine

two religious instructions?—That is one ground, I think; but they also conceded it on the ground of equality of rights to the several communions.

25616. Supposing that in the Church of England schools, the examination into religious teaching was given up, do you not think it exceedingly probable that under the present administration of the Privy Council all the Inspectors would be laymen, and appointed without regard to denomination at all?—That would form a special ground of objection to those examining Catholic schools. Our bishops would say we object altogether to receiving such persons as Inspectors in our schools.

25617. With respect to secular subjects, would it be for the reason mentioned before that history must enter into the teaching?—It may be put, I think, most simply in that form—elementary history; though elementary, it involves the most important facts which concern the human race for eighteen centuries; those must enter into the instruction given in every school. It is impossible that history can be otherwise than what is called—controversial if you like—what I should call religious. It is utterly impossible to exclude the grand point of contention between Catholics and Protestants, whether there is three beginning to end one eternal church of God, or not—you cannot exclude it. It must enter into the subject matter of instruction. The Inspector would have to deal with it. The Catholic bishops would therefore say, it is a great injustice to us that we should be asked to authorize the introduction of a teacher—for such, in fact, the Inspector is—into our schools, who does not hold the same essential elements of belief that we hold.

25618. Sir Robert Keene.—In case of the Government deciding upon a general National system of education for England, and proposing a scheme of undenominational inspection, do you think the Roman Catholic body would accept, and decline any connection with the State?—I cannot tell what they would do with regard to that. Thus I am quite certain of—they would regard it as the greatest possible grievance. The institution of an undenominational or unsectarian system, under whatever form, or with whatever guarantee for liberty, would be considered a great interference, and a great grievance. Whether they would consider the best way of meeting such a misfortune and grievance would be to secede altogether, and set up schools at their own cost, or submit, like other classes, and submitting it as far as they could by their own teaching, I cannot tell. That would be a practical matter; but the other, which is matter of principle, is quite clear to my mind. I am quite certain I am speaking their full sentiment, that they would consider it a great grievance, and a great misfortune; and would consider it a grievance and a misfortune as teaching them more than any other body. What they would consider would be that the institution of an unsectarian system of schools would practically be in favour of the Protestant element throughout the country, and against the Catholic.

25619. I noticed the word you used—"unsectarian," an "unsectarian" system of education and schools. I referred only to an unsectarian system of inspection?—It is the same thing.

25620. You think the two are identical?—Yes.

25621. Mr. Stokes.—Did you ever hear of a case of a Catholic priest, a manager of a school, saying that if he had a Protestant Inspector he might hope for a larger grant?—I can imagine, as a matter of figure, if he thought he was unfairly treated by the Catholic Inspector he would say, upon my word I would rather have a Protestant, who did not care about such things, than such or such a one.

25622. Is it not the case at present that there is no one connected with the Privy Council, until we come down to the Inspectors, who is a Catholic, and therefore able to give the Privy Council any information possibly relating to the Catholic body?—No doubt the fact exists. It would be fairly met by the Privy Council appointing some officer always representing the Catholic element so far.

25623. Is there any such officer at present?—I fancy not.

25624. Sir Robert Keene.—Might there not be Roman Catholics of eminence amongst the Inspectors of the Privy Council without those eminent Roman Catholics being specially connected with the inspection of Catholic schools?—Certainly. If Protestant schools were willing to accept a Catholic Inspector there is no principle which would prevent a Catholic from taking it. For instance—which is the nearest case to it though it does not meet it—there are certain Dissenters who have accepted Church of England Inspectors.

25625. Mr. Stokes.—Does not your body contemplate the establishment of separate schools under the Poor Law Board for destitute children?—Yes.

25626. Do you anticipate that such schools will be inspected by a Catholic officer or will you be content with such inspection as you can get?—We must be content with what we can get. It will be a recovery from a bad state of things. We will consider it better to have those children taught in Catholic schools by Catholics though inspected by a non-Catholic, than to have them in a school where they would be, and are preyed upon without mercy.

25627. Can you regard the matter as one of principle?—It is a principle in itself. It is a question of danger of different degrees to be undergone.

25628. You are clearly of opinion that if possible it is very desirable for your body to maintain that system of inspection?—Certainly, and more than that, I think with us it is very different from what it would be with regard to any other class. We are a set of men who each all others out. The Dissenters don't prey upon each other. They are content with equal right for themselves. There is a greater antipathy, no doubt, between the Established Church and the Dissenters, but even with that feeling of antipathy many a Dissenter will allow his child to be brought up in the Established Church school as there is so much alike in the teaching. It is quite different with regard to Roman Catholics. There is a fundamental difference, so that we in such a system of unsectarian education should be preyed upon in a way in which no other class in the United Kingdom would be preyed upon.

25629. Sir Robert Keene.—Do you not think the Irish system would be accepted as guarding against what you apprehend?—I think the whole system of Irish education is an exemplification of all I say. It is a system which would never be endured by the people of England. For instance, if the four and a half millions of Irish Catholics were English we should have driven into the North Sea, as Dr Newman once said, the contents of such a system of education. It has never been done in any country but Ireland, and it has been done here because Ireland is a conquered country. It would never be suffered by Englishmen.

25630. Lord Bishop of Meath.—Are your ordinary schools entirely composed of Roman Catholic children?—As a general rule they are so, but it may happen, that in a particular district, some Protestant children may attend. I have heard of such instances—in such instances for a while the matter has been mentioned.

25631. They are exceptional?—Quite exceptional.

25632. The Roman Catholic prelates in England claim, as they do in other Roman Catholic countries—at least in this country—the right of controlling education in general, especially that of the young?—So far as religion and morals.

25633. That embraces almost all subjects?—They would by their own statement certainly admit it embraced the whole teaching of the school, partly directly, and partly indirectly.

25634. Now, do the Roman Catholic body in England concern quite with the hierarchy in that view of the privileges of the Church, with regard to education?—They would universally admit and entirely recognize that the management of the religious and moral part of the education was exclusively in the hands of their clergy—for it is, in fact, a doctrine of our faith. With regard to the other part of the education system, I think the body would claim a certain right of inter-

Feb 18, 1880.

Thomas W. Allen, esq.  
Q. A.

Feb. 18, 1869,  
Thomas W  
Allen, Esq.,  
M.P.

ference, for instance, in the financial part. They would strongly feel that a certain control of the financial part belonged to them, as contributing to the funds very largely.

25643 Would they claim any right in reference to education, properly so called?—I think so. With regard to the secular part of education, the three primary "R's," as they are called, reading, writing, and arithmetic, and all that follows upon them, they would claim a certain share in that. Nor is there any division between them and their bishops on that score; the bishops would fully admit they had a right to do so.

25646 I may assume then, that, in England, the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic Church are quite at one in reference to the principles upon which primary education ought to be conducted?—Yes, I think so. In the course of the twenty-one years during which my committee has represented both clergy and laity, there has never started up anything like a difference in principle between them.

25647 I am to understand that the Roman Catholic clergy and laity in England are quite agreed upon the general principle of primary education?—I think so.

25648 Supposing they were not—supposing a considerable portion of the laity believed that the clergy claimed too much in reference to the education of the young, would that make any difference in the working of the schools?—I think it would, because it is not only in our schools, but equally I think in the schools of the Established Church, the chief managers practically are the clergy, sometimes exclusively. The difficulty the Privy Council have found not only in reference to our schools, but to schools generally—at any rate so far as the Established Church schools as well as ours, is to find these laymen who would manage the money grants. As an ordinary rule it is found that the clergy alone take a strong interest in the matter.

25649 Assuming that there is a diversity of opinion to some extent prevailing in Ireland between the Roman Catholic clergy and laity, then the principle that holds in England with respect to primary education would not apply in Ireland?—I don't quite see how that would be; I don't think there is any difference in principle between them on the one hand or the other.

25649 In England you say the laity claim a certain right with regard to the books containing secular instruction. They do not give up the right of expressing their opinion in reference to them?—I don't think the question has arisen in England; we have had no difficulty on the subject.

25651 I think you said the chief difficulty as to having non-denominational Inspectors arose from the fact that history is a necessary portion of the examination, and that history cannot be properly examined into without reference to what may be called controversial matters?—I might mentioned the subject of history as bringing out the principle difficulty in the strongest and simplest form.

25642 Would the difficulty apply in any other branch?—Yes, it applies excluding history altogether. I think the bishops would feel that the introduction of an Inspector, who is professed a teacher, into their schools, who did not belong to their own faith, would be a stirring over of the essential differences which exist between the two communities. It would be taking the faith that we profess to have a truth less dear to the minds of all the children uponceptibly. I don't mean to say a child is capable of drawing out philosophically the fact. But the fact that a person appears before a child in a position of great authority in the school—with no less an authority than that of obediencing to them the State assistance to the schools—that such a person who came those invested with to them perhaps a higher authority than any other person except the bishop, should be not of their own faith, it is a great injury to the child's faith itself. He is not able to draw that out philosophically, but he knows that Mr. So-and-so who comes, and is to him the head of the State, putting the school in possession of a certain amount of public aid, does not belong to his own faith.

25643 Do you think that if a sensible, well-informed

and moderate Protestant went to examine a Roman Catholic school he could not ascertain the amount of secular knowledge acquired by the children sufficiently to enable him to report to the State whether that school was in an efficient position in reference to what is commonly called secular knowledge?—I think so, quite. That applies to all classes equally. There is no doubt a man of intelligence, and practical tact, and kind feeling might go into any school of any religion on the face of the earth, and examine into such matters—carefully abstaining from entering into the religious question—but that would not be inspection in the high sense of the word.

25644 It would be an inspection that would satisfy the State?—It might satisfy the State. My argument is, it would not satisfy the component parts of the State, the individuals.

25645 I cannot find there is any other subject, except history, that would be likely to necessitate the introduction of controversial considerations. Why might not that subject of history be left to the recognized teachers of the school, and let those who set so high a value upon the children's knowledge of history as controversial points ascertain that knowledge for themselves?—That means then the exclusion from the school of the facts which concern human nature and man in his highest capacity, because that is history.

25646 I assume that that would be taught by the teachers of the schools themselves?—I don't see how it could be excluded from the ordinary instruction of the school. It would surely be most unnatural to exclude the points of primary importance.

25647 I speak only of inspection—is it necessary for the Inspector to ascertain these?—I understood the meaning of the question was that such subjects should be excluded from the practical teaching of the school.

25648 No; from the inquiries of the Inspector?—Then the result would be that the inspection did not extend to the most important points taught in the school.

25649 Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Is not this plan pressed very often by Inspectors in England on controversial subjects where they fancy there might be some difficulty, viz, to ask the teacher or manager to examine in his presence?—They might do that—and I should admit most fully that the practical tact of a wise and experienced Inspector might manage all these things. I do not in the least doubt that a Protestant Inspector might examine a Catholic school in a very fair manner, of course excluding certain points; but his tact would lead him to exclude these points.

25650 Lord Bishop of Meath.—Do you think the mode proposed by Mr. Cowie would be a sufficient means of ascertaining the knowledge of the children in that particular department of history?—No, I cannot think that, because you must exclude, in fact, the whole structure of history; for, literally, it extends over the whole eighteen centuries.

25651 I mean that the Protestant Inspector, instead of examining the children himself, might ask the teachers to examine?—He might do that certainly. There would, of course, be this great practical danger, that the Catholic teacher, knowing how the wind lay, would take care not to bring such answers out as would displease the Inspector. I think that is very certain to occur, from an instance mentioned by a Commissioner, of a Catholic teacher who taught the children a particular catechism. We should have the same thing in another form.

25652 The *Chancellor*.—Have the Roman Catholics of England ever alleged that the requiring the arms to submit themselves to examination before they got recognized by the Privy Council as teachers was an insult to them as a religious body?—No, they never considered it an insult, as their attendance was optional, and as there was a certain pecuniary advantage attached to attending, and a certain advantage to the schools. The name that chose to undergo that examination could hardly call it an insult, as they were treated with perfect courtesy, and as there was no examination.

into religious matters. It was only a sort of thing that would naturally be unpleasant to them.

25653. Mr. Mr. Crooke.—Are you aware that at the last examination at Stockwell, at Christmas, there were six Belgian nuns examined for certificates?—I was not. I mentioned before that candidates of ours had gone to Protestant training schools near there, to be examined.

25654. This was a denominational Training School—one for Dominicans. I visited it with a friend, Dr. Deane, and we ascertained that the nuns had a private room assigned to them, and that being in rubber week, they were provided with the food that they desired; in fact, every facility was given to them to keep to themselves, and to observe all their rules. Have you any other instance of that?—The only instance I know of like it are those I mentioned before in answer to another question, cases in which candidates of ours obtained leave to go to a Protestant training school nearer to them than the Catholic one, in order to save the trouble and expense of a journey.

25655. Is there any instance of nuns making a demand to be examined in their own home?—I think not.

25656. Mr. Deane.—Would that be objectionable?—I don't think the Privy Council would accede to it. They have only three inspectors to manage the whole thing. Therefore they could not spare an inspector to do that.

25657. Mr. Sullivan.—Considering that the University of London now sends an examination for the granting of degrees into different colleges, might it not be done?—If we had thirty candidates at one time we might prefer such a suggestion, and they might possibly grant it if they had liberty to do so.

25658. The London University would I believe send an examiner for three candidates?—The Privy Council might arrange to have more persons available for the purpose of examining, and in such a case they might adopt that system.

25659. Mr. Deane.—Do you see any objection, except on the grounds of increased expense, to sending inspectors to the candidates for examination instead of sending the candidates to the inspectors at a few places?—It does not strike me there is any.

25660. Mr. Stokes.—Do you remember that before training schools were established, about the year 1854, an examination was actually held in the school adjoining a convent at Liverpool?—I do not remember.

25661. Mr. Deane.—You stated just now that you believed that the Catholic clergy and laity of England was completely as one on the subject of education. May I ask whether you have formed that belief from the fact that there has never been any public expression of a divergence of opinion between the clergy and laity about primary education?—I don't remember any difference that has arisen in the last fifteen years. I have not before my mind any instance that occurred since I have been secretary.

25662. I am speaking of any expression of opinion of the Catholic body outside your Poor School Committee?—I don't remember any. I am not aware of any.

25663. Do you ground your belief in the non-existence of such a feeling upon the fact that there has been no public expression of it?—Yes; and I have not heard any private expression of it.

25664. Lord Chelmsford.—Do you experience any difficulty in getting sites for schools?—In some places very great difficulty. There again the Privy Council regulations are too stringent in requiring fee-simple, or if a leasehold not less than ninety-nine years. In London it is almost impossible to get such a thing. Some most admirable schools have been built in my own parish, and nothing would induce the landlord, the Duke of Portland, to grant a site in fee-simple. He would refuse full money value—so with the other great London proprietors. Accordingly, in the cases to which I refer of schools in my own parish the Privy Council refused to grant, and we lost a couple of thousand pounds. I ought to have mentioned that as one of the reasons why many building grants have not been obtained by us—that is, the requiring fee-simple sites. The Privy Council are very strict on that. If

they admit a lease it is under very stringent conditions. Altogether they make very great difficulty on that point.

25665. The site is vested in trustees?—Yes.

25666. By whom are the trustees named?—By the managers of the school.

25667. Are they people who undertake to manage the school?—Yes.

25668. And they are the trustees?—Yes.

25669. In rural districts are there many places where there is a necessity for Roman Catholic schools, and where there would be a difficulty in getting sites?—Our Catholic population has very much in the great towns, and it is in these the chief difficulties are experienced in procuring sites. It is much more easy, generally speaking, to obtain freehold ground in rural districts.

25670. Mr. Stokes.—Is not the great object in selecting trustees to choose men of station and eminence whose heirs would be at once found?—Yes.

25671. The trustees are what are called "bare trustees"?—Yes; simply holding the property subject to the trusts. It was suggested that each diocese should name two or three persons of the highest rank and position in the diocese, who could act as trustees generally for schools in the diocese. That was not done. I wish it was.

25672. Lord Chelmsford.—Are schools held by a single manager, or by a Committee?—It might be in the hands of an individual manager. In order to get a grant the application must be signed by three persons. Practically, the management might be in one person.

25673. Mr. Stokes.—In case of an application for a building grant, if the managers were able to show that there was no person in his congregation of sufficient rank to join him, would not his own sole management be accepted?—Yes.

25674. Lord Chelmsford.—Who appoints the teachers of the schools?—The manager.

25675. A single manager or a committee?—If there were only one individual manager he would appoint, and if there were a committee the committee would appoint. Practically as the religious instruction is for the clergyman he must have a potential voice in the matter—he must be satisfied as to the religious teaching.

25676. Who appoints and removes the teacher?—The managers would, but the chief manager is in almost every case the clergyman. Of course if there were an instance of a nobleman or gentleman establishing a school of his own he would be the chief manager of the school.

25677. Am I to understand there is generally a committee of management?—Generally.

25678. And a single manager?—No, "the manager," as he is called, would be one of the committee of management.

25679. Is the appointment and dismissal of the master in the hands of the committee or in the hands of the individual manager?—The dismissal for all ordinary purposes is in the hands of the committee, but if the dismissal is on account of any religious matter then it would be in the hands of the priest.

25680. And the appointment?—If a new teacher were to be appointed succeeding such a dismissal, it would be in the hands of the committee of management of whom the priest would be one.

25681. Mr. Stokes.—In case of a school built by a landed proprietor upon his estate who appoints?—The landed proprietor.

25682. Mr. Gilson.—What is the average amount of salary your teachers receive?—The masters receive, I suppose, from £40 with chambers to £80. I would rather say from £50, though there are some get only £40. The female teachers receive from £30 to £50 a year.

25683. Lord Chelmsford.—Do they pay for their own residences?—I am afraid they do in a great many cases, not always.

25684. The Chancellor.—I suppose you can state the lowest income of a schoolmaster?—I should be afraid to state the lowest—it is something so variable.

[Adjourned.]

Feb 15, 1922.

Thomas W  
Allen, esq.,  
S.R.

SIXTY-SEVENTH DAY.—DUBLIN, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1865.

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of POWIS, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. Lord CLOSBROOK.  
The Right Hon. Mr. Justice MORRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, *F.R.S.*  
WILLIAM BEECHER, Esq., M.C.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWLE, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEASER, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q.C.  
SCOTT NASHVILLE STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., *M.P.*

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } *Secretaries*  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

CORNELIUS MARONEY, Esq., further examined.

Feb 19, 1865.

Cornelius  
Maroney, esq.

25625. The *Chairman*.—We understand that there are some points on which you wish to give an explanation of your evidence?—Yes, my lord. At my former examination I was asked a question, by Sir Robert Kane, with regard to what he termed a secular system of instruction. What I understood, at the time, by the term, "secular system" was a purely secular system from which all religious teaching was to be excluded. The question was explained to me very fully afterwards, but—I suppose, having the other idea so strongly before my mind—I gave some two or three answers that were really irrelevant, and did not touch the question. I have since considered it. I stated briefly in answer to a question put to me, whether I considered that system—by which I understand the same system as has been proposed by the Bishop of Osnabruck and by Mr. Warren, the present Judge of the Probate Court—equally objectionable with the principle of the Church Education Society, from which I of course dissent; and I stated at the time that they seemed to me equally objectionable. On considering the question more fully, since then, I have a very clear conviction that such a system is even more objectionable than the system of the Church Education Society, because the Church Education Society enforces no religious teaching upon those who do not belong to the Established Church, except the teaching of Scripture. It restricts the teaching of the Church Catechism and Church formularies to Church children exclusively. Besides, the Church Education Society gives school, definite times for secular and religious instruction. I recollect having seen and examined the time-table used in the Church Education Society's schools. I inquired some time ago at the office for a copy of that time-table, but they had not one to give me. However, I have a recollection of one that is

given in the Appendix to the House of Lords' Inquiry in 1854; and the impression on my mind is that a National school could be conducted in accordance with the time-table of the Church Education Society's schools. Besides, if the manager was not restricted as to religious teaching, he might introduce controversial teaching; and he might introduce it at various times. There would be no regulation as regards time. If it was my duty—as the servant of the State—to examine the school, my business would be merely to see that the secular education was sufficient. And the manager might, if he thought proper, introduce religious teaching fifty times a day, and introduce religious teaching of a controversial kind. Therefore, I consider it even more objectionable. Moreover exception was taken to a statement of mine on the ground of my note-books being carelessly or negligently filled. Now, whether note-books are prospective, for example, note of a thing to be done, such as a lecture, or sermon, or speech, or legal argument, or whether they be retrospective, a person may make very meagre notes of either, and do the business equally well as if he had the whole thing written out in full. Besides, in taking notes of a school, there are two things to be done. First, there are certain statistics to be taken. I would distrust my memory very much in taking these statistics. But I would trust to my memory as to the actual state of education without taking a note at all. As regards the report that was quoted at my examination, I had a recollection of it, and I stated that I was able to say—on my oath—that it contained more than one false statement. I have since examined that report more carefully. I have it here before me. And I am able to state most positively that it contains at least eight mis-statements where I am personally concerned.

JOHN G. RICHARDSON, Esq., Beasbrook, affirmed and examined.

John G.  
Richardson,  
esq.

25626. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Mr. Richardson, may I ask what is your residence?—Mayall House, in the county of Down. The factory place about which, I suppose, I am going to be questioned, is Beasbrook, near Newry.

25627. Do you reside near Beasbrook?—No, I reside about fourteen miles from it.

25628. What is your business or profession?—Linen merchant, flax spinner, &c.

25629. Are you a landed proprietor also?—Yes.

25630. In what neighbourhood?—The neighbourhood of Newry.

25631. Now to this place Beasbrook?—Yes.

25632. Have you any objection to say to what extent?—Well, I have between six and seven thousand acres. I have what was lately Lord Chalmers's property in that neighbourhood, I really forget the number of acres.

25633. At what time did you begin operations at Beasbrook as a manufacturer?—In 1846.

25634. What is the number of schools that you have

at Beasbrook?—One large united school for boys, girls, and infants.

25635. Your schools are under the National Board?—My schools are under the National Board.

25636. Do you admit clergy of different denominations to give religious instruction there?—No, we have always refused, so as to keep an even hand; we have refused to admit any clergyman, except as a visitor, and I believe that they are all better satisfied that we did so.

25637. Who are "they all" to whom you refer?—I mean to say that Church of England, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholic clergymen are all better satisfied that we held an even hand and did not introduce the thing.

25638. Did you ever permit any interference with the religious principles or action of the children attending your school?—No.

25639. Was there ever the slightest wish on your part that the children should receive any religious instruction contrary to the wish of their parents?—Certainly not.

25640. Has that ever been made a matter of con-



plaint by any single Roman Catholic parent, directly or indirectly?—Never; I have been cross-examining our manager and teachers and I never heard of an instance, with the exception of one that was made when a Roman Catholic clergyman called in 1854—I think it was in 1854—and I find registered that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newry had sent him to enquire and examine our schools, and he examined into the report, and he wrote to the bishop to say that it was false.

25701. Which report?—A report that he got. Some complaint was sent to the Roman Catholic bishop of Newry, and he employed the parish priest, the present man, McKeivitt, to come to our school, and I find registered upon our books a memorandum which I read this morning, if you allow me to read my manager's report?—I remember the parish priest (McKeivitt) asking my attention some years since to the statement of Mr. Kavanaugh, from a communication he received from the Bishop of Newry. Father McKeivitt visited the school and showed me his reply to the bishop, in which he stated that he did not consider that there was any ground for Kavanaugh's statement, Father McKeivitt further expressed his approval of the way the school is managed.

25702. Can you say whether at that time when Mr. Kavanaugh made his visit, a great majority of the children were Roman Catholics?—I cannot remember 1854, but I have always tried to equalize the population, and we have about 5,000 there, and we have about 1,200 on each side; we have tried to keep about an even balance.

25703. Do you think that a good arrangement?—Yes, it has answered well.

25704. Did you bring, or allow to be brought, any pressure whatever to bear upon the parents of the Roman Catholic children, so as to secure their attendance at the reading of the Bible?—No. We adopted a system twenty-two years ago, when I first put my school under the Board. I corresponded with the managers, and I arranged with them the best system I could adopt for the purpose of carrying out honestly the intentions of the Government; and the plan we agreed upon was to put "religious instruction" over the door of the school, and to commence at half-past nine, for half-an-hour, leaving it entirely optional with the children to come or not, as they chose. I may add that, since the schools became larger, we saw the advantage, to prevent any jealousy, of appointing a Roman Catholic teacher in the male school; and the consequence was that, when the children came there at the half-past nine, if any Roman Catholic children did, they might have a teacher of their own persuasion.

25705. You belong to the Society of Friends?—Yes.

25706. Your teachers were Episcopalians or Presbyterians at first, I understand?—I believe they were. Yes.

25707. Mr. Kavanaugh, when you have named, on the 11th of July, before the Commission, stated, in regard to Besbrook and other places, that pressure was brought to bear on Roman Catholic children by Protestant employers. He says—"In the year 1854, I visited the Besbrook mill schools, near Newry, three departments—boys, girls, infants—and a fourth I did not see working, the evening school. The teachers were all Protestants or Presbyterians, and a great majority of the children were Catholics." Now, at that time, was a great majority of the children Roman Catholics, do you think?—Well, it is possible that there may have been a considerable majority; because, when we settled first there, the population were largely Roman Catholics, and, to equalize the population, I brought up, on purpose, a certain number of Church of England, and Presbyterians, and Methodists, and Friends, so as to mix them all, and to endeavour to create harmony, and avoid any political or religious distinctions, if I possibly could; and hence we have had peace and comfort, I think, more than ordinary.

25708. He says also—"The Scriptures were read daily in the school, and the Catholic children attended

—and in answer to this question—"You have mentioned that there was pressure brought to bear upon these Catholic children," his reply is, "Yes." Is that true, in any sense, so far as you know?—Certainly not, so far as I know. I have examined our late manager, and present manager, and our teachers, and I never heard of it; and I am sure it would not have been done without our instructions.

25709. When asked to say what amounted to pressure, he replied—"The fact that these were the children of dependent Catholic workmen of these employers, and that it was expected that their children should attend the Bible class, and that they conformed to that wish, and that in so conforming, they were perfectly well aware they were doing a reprehensible act." When asked again—"Do you regard that as pressure?" and his reply is—"Certainly, quite as much as a landlord making his tenants to vote at an election, under a notice to quit." Did you, or anyone for you, at least, with your knowledge, bring the least pressure to bear on a single Roman Catholic parent?—Certainly not; I do not believe they ever did. The only pressure we have ever used is to force the children to come to school. We tax all the families for their children, in every head, suitable to come to the school—that is to enforce them to be educated.

25710. To receive what sort of instruction?—To receive the ordinary school education—the ordinary instruction authorized by the Board.

25711. On the day on which this evidence was given, I addressed a note to you. Would you be so kind as to read your reply of October 27th, beginning at the fourth line?—[Letter handed to witness.] This is my handwriting (Reads).—"It has always been our wish to deal fairly and generously with what we believe to be the best system of education, to bring all parties into one focus, and create kindly feelings in early life. The best proof that we did not, in 1854, try to interfere or persecute is, that the head master was a Presbyterian, and his wife was the mistress, and the assistants Church, we, the proprietors, being 'Friends.' When the boys school became large enough we added a Roman Catholic mistress, who now guides the Roman Catholic flock into one portion of the school, and teaches his religious instruction, whilst the head master instructs the different Protestants, by reading the Bible, this being done half-an-hour before the school hour. We never had one complaint amongst our three thousand people, that we can remember, of any interference with the religious views of the children."

25712. You had persons, I believe, in connexion with you at that time?—I had at one time, but the concern is mine now.

25713. Is their testimony at that date precisely similar to yours?—Yes, I have got letters with me from each of the firms.

25714. Is their testimony similar to yours?—Yes.

25715. Then, will you be so kind as to put in the letter of your brother and Mr. Owen, they were your partners at that time, I believe?—My eldest brother, and a gentleman of the name of Owen, were partners up to 1845. There is a letter from our manager which is of more importance, because he was the direct manager, and he is not with us now, and he was a member of the Church of England.

25716. And, as manager, was it his business to attend to the mode of conducting these schools?—Yes, he had the oversight of the schools.

25717. Read the letter, please?—Reads—

"New Lodge, Antrim,  
December 8th, 1858

"DEAR SIR,—As you are aware, I was manager of all the establishments at Besbrook, in the year 1854; and I have much pleasure in stating, that there never was any coercion used or undue influence exercised upon Roman Catholic children to induce them to attend religious instruction in the National school. The master of the school at that time was a most conscientious man, and strict in adherence to the rules of the Board, and, I believe, quite incapable of acting in the manner complained of, and it either he or any other parties had so acted, it must have come to my knowledge."

Feb. 15, 1859

John G.  
Bakerston,  
esq.

Feb. 13, 1859

John G.  
Richardson,  
esq.

25718. Who signs that?—William Dawson.

25719. What was the name of the teacher at that period?—Brian. I have a report from him. He has also left us. He is in another school. (Reads letter).—

"Belfast, December 2nd, 1858.

"Dear Sir.—I remember the visit of Head Inspector Kavanagh to Bushbrook National School, I think about the year 1864 (the year in which I was married). He only paid two visits in my time to the school, both in the same week. The Roman Catholics, in my time, were fewer at any time in a majority, particularly so in the day schools, and in the night schools the proportion of Roman Catholics was larger than in the day schools, but as no religious instruction was ever given in the latter they should not be reckoned. The religious instruction given during my time, consisted of reading the Authorized Version of the Scriptures without note or comment; and I can safely assert, and am ready to testify anywhere, that no person was ever directly or indirectly brought to bear on Roman Catholic children or parents, to cause them to attend religious instruction. Such a proceeding would have been in direct contradiction to the orders given to me by the proprietors of the concern.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"WILLIAM DAWSON, Teacher,

"Bushbrook National School.

"J. G. Richardson, esq."

25720. Is there a Roman Catholic chapel in Bushbrook?—They are building one now.

25721. And a Roman Catholic priest in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

25722. Did he ever express his satisfaction, can you say, with the improved manner in which the schools were conducted?—Yes, he called with this complaint, and showed the complaint, and showed the letter he wrote to the bishop, saying that he did not believe in it.

25723. You say that you have an assistant teacher at present a Roman Catholic?—Yes.

25724. Was he connected with the school in any way in 1854?—He was a child there.

25725. Can you say of what age?—I cannot remember. He is somewhere between twenty five and thirty.

25726. Do you know his opinion with regard to the subject referred to?—Certainly, he says that there never was any influence used upon him, or upon any one else that he knew of.

25727. Mr. Sullivan.—The Authorized Version was read generally in the school, was it?—Half an hour before the school.

25728. And did any Roman Catholic join in reading the Authorized Version?—No, I rather think not. So far as the schoolmaster says, not, and we know that there was no such jealousy that we were particularly anxious to avoid it, and my present manager, who has had the management of the schools since 1857 (I read from his report) says—"I do not know of a single instance in which a Roman Catholic child has received religious instruction from a Protestant teacher since 1857. No complaint was ever made to me, and I do not think it occurred."

25729. But we are dealing with 1854?—But I have read you the master's report then, and the manager's report.

25730. Does he state that no Roman Catholic attended the reading of the Authorized Version?—(Reads.) "The religious instruction given during my time consisted of reading the Authorized Version of the Scriptures, without note or comment; and I can safely assert and am ready to testify anywhere that no person was ever directly or indirectly brought to bear on Roman Catholic children or parents to cause them to attend religious instruction." He does not say it, but all I can say is for myself, that from the time when we first commenced there, particularly as we knew it was in a Roman Catholic district, that I gave special instructions (for it nearly all came from me as the master of the firm who took the most active interest in that branch of the business) that no Roman Catholic children should be brought there at all, and that notice should be sent to the parent if a child came. Now I find from our manager, that since 1857, that has been carried out. In one or two instances we have taught

before we appointed this teacher, the parent was immediately informed.

25731. But it may have happened so far as any evidence we have had before us, that Roman Catholics did attend, though the teacher says he used no compulsion?—It may, but I do not think it was at all likely, because it was contrary to instructions. We agreed upon a plan with the Commissioners, if I remember right, that we should notice the parents immediately, but we would not turn the children out if they did come.

25732. Was that in 1854?—Always; from the time the school commenced.

25733. Every child that can attend the school is obliged to pay—you deduct it from his parents?—Yes.

25734. Then is not the child therefore obliged, under pain of forfeiture of that amount of money to attend the school?—Not before ten o'clock. They all understand perfectly well, that the religious instruction takes place from half-past nine to ten, and they do not come there if they do not want it.

25735. And if a child happened to come a quarter of an hour before?—He would go to the Roman Catholic teacher now.

25736. But I am speaking of 1854?—Then the parent would be immediately informed.

25737. But have we any evidence whatever to prove that in every case such did occur, or have we any evidence to prove, in fact, that it may not have occurred that Roman Catholics did attend?—I could not, of course, positively prove the thing, for I was not present to see.

25738. Lord Olinbrough.—Did you not state to this Commission and also give the statement of this teacher who acted for so long a time, that the Roman Catholic bishop had sent down one of his clergy to investigate the matter, and that that clergyman sent a report to his bishop saying that there was no ground for the charge?—Yes, he read the letter and very kindly came forward. We should not have known anything about it if he did not volunteer it himself. He came to the office and showed us the letter and showed us his answer.

25739. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are those the only schools under your management?—I have schools under the Board of the same character at Moyalee, where I live.

25740. Are you prepared to offer any opinion on the subject of mixed education as suited to this country?—If I am at liberty to do so.

25741. If you please?—It is a subject in which I have taken a very great interest from the very commencement, approving of the system, and I was very anxious to see it carried out honestly and fairly, because I believe it the best calculated for the harmony of this country; and I have no reason to change my opinion. I believe, if faithfully worked and carried out, it is the best system to promote harmony in this country, and the best evidence of that that I can offer is, that there has been no proselytism of any kind. We have been inquiring, and out of our large population, in both places that we have been dealing with for twenty-two years, there is no single instance of a Roman Catholic child grown up who has changed his religious name, whilst there are a few grown up people who never were at the school, who have changed on both sides. There is not a single child changed, and I have made inquiry.

25742. In connection with the school?—In connection with the school.

25743. Now, with regard to this system of mixed education, you have stated that it promotes harmony and mutual forbearance, I think, amongst the people. Do you regard it as necessary, or as desirable, for the promotion of the temporal and the social welfare of the people?—Yes; I believe that the result with us has been as explained, that the fact of the young people being brought up together at schools, and meeting together at schools, and playing together, has produced a regard for each other in afterlife, however they may differ upon religious opinions, so that the young

people have not the same bitter feelings towards each other that their parents had.

25744. Now, on pecuniary and other grounds, do you consider this system of education advantageous or otherwise to the interests of the State, with regard, for instance, to the population of this district of Bessbrook?—As you require any police to keep the peace there?—No, we have neither police, public house, nor public-house. They all go together, I think, very much.

25745. Any quarrelling amongst the people on account of religion and religious distinctions?—I cannot say that there is none, but there is less than in most places.

25746. Are the parties in your employment for the most part Irish?—A large proportion are Irish. There are a few sprinklings of English I brought over for the purpose of adding to the harmony of the place, as they are not, generally, political.

25747. As you are in the habit of meeting with parties from all districts of this country, can you express any opinion as to the views of Roman Catholic gentry in reference to mixed education as suited to the country?—Yes, I know several who hold my opinions on the subject. I know one especially, the late member for Newry, Brady, of Newry, who has very strong opinions in favour of the present system.

25748. Has he expressed it?—Yes, not very long since, at the last election; he was speaking upon it as a subject in which he takes the very interest that I do.

25749. Has he stated anything definite that you feel at liberty to state now?—Nothing, except that he was decidedly in favour of it, as the system best suited for the country.

25750. Sir Robert Kane—When that Roman Catholic gentleman stated his opinion and expressed his opinion to you as favourable to the system of united education, you mentioned it was at the time of an election?—Well, it was previously, it was in speaking of political subjects. He was speaking to me as to who ought to be returned for Newry, and what the points of consideration on his mind were; and, in the course of conversation, he said that that was one great point. It is a favorite hobby that he rides.

25751. He knew that you were warmly in favour of that view?—I do not know whether he did or not; I dare say he did. He found that we agreed.

25752. It was not with the view of confirming your political supposition?—No; not the least, he supported it, and was in Parliament at the time it passed, and he was very much in favour of it.

25753. Do you consider, then, from the opinions, so far as you have heard them expressed, that the Roman Catholic middle class and gentry of the district with which you are acquainted have not any hostility to the existing system of united education?—No, I cannot say that. I believe that directions from head-quarters are so strong upon the subject at present as to carry denominational education with a large majority. All those who do not choose to think for themselves, who do not think for themselves, are influenced in that direction, opposed to the system instead of being in favour of it. But there are a few men who think for themselves, belonging to the Roman Catholic body, whom I know. I do not consider that I should be justified in mentioning their names, because it would be scarcely fair, but in coming in contact with these with whom I am intimate, I know they were decidedly of my opinion on the subject.

25754. From your experience, do you infer that some of the opposition to the united system of education amongst the Roman Catholics of your acquaintance is derived from what you described as directions from head-quarters?—Yes, the answer has been given to me; I have received a direct answer to a question, "it has been the order of our bishop, and the archbishop has such an opinion, and we have a right—we desire to follow it, and we do hold that opinion." They do not think for themselves. There is no doubt about it.

25755. Mr. Storer—What is the practice of the

Society of Friends in conducting schools for the better classes?—Private schools.

25756. Are such schools strictly denominational schools?—They are.

25757. Why do you prefer one system for the better class children, and another for the poor children?—I think the same answer might be given, as to the question, why do the higher classes of different religious persuasions choose to select schools under Church of England clergyman, and Roman Catholic clergyman, &c. Now, with regard to the Society of Friends, they send their children to those in whom they have entire confidence, as to their moral and religious training.

25758. Do you not believe that if the same freedom was allowed to the poorer classes they would prefer to place their children with those in whom they had confidence?—But I was going to say, that with regard to the same class, the same rank in life, connected with our own Society, of which we have some two or three hundred in Bessbrook, we apply the same argument equally, and they go to the same school.

25759. Will you allow me to read the following passage, from the report of the Endowed Schools Commission—

"The schools of the Society of Friends are all under the care of the quarterly meetings of the Society, which are held for religious purposes in the districts in which the schools are situated. They are also governed by committees, which are confined to members of the Society of Friends. The masters belong to that body, and the system of religious instruction is that adopted by the Society. One of the institutions is intended for the benefit of distressed children, being descendants of persons who have been Friends, but who have left the Society. It is kept entirely distinct from those intended for the education of the children of others in full membership, but all the pupils are brought up in the religious principles of the Society, and upon a plan similar to that pursued in other institutions."

Does that statement represent the practice?—Yes. Well, the answer to that is this, for instance, we have not what is called poor in the Society, and if a family belonging to the Society are poor and cannot educate their children themselves, boarding schools are provided for the purpose, and now in schools of that kind, in the north of Ireland, the parents give £3 a year, or more if they can, though the education costs £35. Now, we could scarcely be expected to apply that rule to people who are Roman Catholics, and who belong to the Church of England, as we should get the credit of proselytising by paying £30 a year for them. That is the course of proceeding which we take to educate our children; those belonging to the poorer members of the body; but those who can afford to pay for the education of their children, send them, as other gentlemen do, to England. My own son was sent to a private school near London. And members of the Society of Friends who can afford it, educate their children exactly on the same principle, and they send them to those in whom they have most confidence.

25760. In reference to the children of persons who have been members of the Society, but who have left the Society, is it consistent with your principles to give them the religious instruction of Friends?—We take up the poor children, because their parents or their grandparents have lost their membership by some misconduct or other, and as they have not united themselves with any other religious body. We have found a good many in the north of Ireland, quite or almost without education, not connecting themselves with any body, and we have started a school in the north of Ireland for educating them. They cost about £15 or £16 a year a head, and the parents contribute nothing; so that it is what may be called a charitable school.

25761. Are these charity boys brought up strictly in the religion of the Society of Friends?—Of course.

25762. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Is there not this difference or distinction, that such children attending these schools are sent away from home influences?—Altogether.

25763. Whereas the children of the National schools

Feb. 23, 1849.

John G. Richardson,  
Esq.

Feb. 19, 1862.  
John G.  
Richardson,  
esq.

of the country are under these influences from day to day?—Yes, but the same class of children at Bessbrook, where a National school is provided, are not sent there at all. They are picked up in different parts of the county where there are no schools, and the parents cannot feed them, or are drunken and ill-behaved, and they are brought into this focus for the purpose of doing them good, and getting situations for them afterwards.

25764 Judge Morris.—Has Mr. Brady, who is famous for his strong feeling in favour of the National system of education at present established in Ireland, taken any open mode of explaining his opinion?—I am not aware that he has, because I make it a point never to attend political meetings. I really do not know what he may have said or done. I only know the conversation that took place between us when we met as a committee to know who was to represent Newry, when we went to support, and on what grounds. He stated there before the other gentlemen and myself his opinion.

25765. You stated that he advocated it in Parliament?—So I understood from him that he did.

25766. Has this gentleman been in Parliament for the last thirty years?—Well it is, I suppose, twenty or twenty-five years.

25767. Has he been for the last thirty years in Parliament?—I am not aware, but he has been in Parliament since the National Board has been in existence.

25768. But that is some thirty-five years ago?—Yes, I know.

25769. Was it at a political meeting that he expressed his opinion to you?—Well, it may be called so or not. It was a private meeting to consult together whether we could agree upon some member calculated for the best interests of Newry.

25770. He was a Roman Catholic?—Yes.

25771.—Then he yielded to that portion of the com-

mittee?—No; excuse me, quite the reverse, because he propounded it himself.

25772. Then he wished to avoid the imputation probably that he might be suspected of—of being an opponent of the National system, and he volunteered at this mixed committee?—No; it is a favourite hobby of his, and therefore he propounded it.

25773. Did any other leading Roman Catholic gentlemen in Newry attend at that private?—Several of them.

25774. Did they propose the same hobby?—No, they preferred to leave the question out altogether.

25775. They wished the question to be left out altogether?—Yes.

25776. Then from all the other Roman Catholic gentlemen who attended the meeting wishing to leave the question out altogether, did not you infer that their views were quite different from those of the gentleman with the hobby?—Some of them were, but perhaps some of them were more than half convinced.

25777. Was not the principal object of this mixed committee who had a common object in bringing in a particular member, to sink their differences and put forward a platform that they could all agree upon?—No doubt of that; that was the ground upon which I put forward his statement.

25778. This was a hobby?—Yes.

25779. And was this hobby about the National system of education put forward as a part of the platform upon which the candidate was to be put forward?—No; we agreed to leave it out. We had enough to do with the Church question at the moment.

25780. Mr. Stokes.—At the time you have referred to—twenty-five years ago—was not the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newry a decided supporter of the National system?—I do not remember. I have no idea at all I know that the Bishop of Belfast was, when I know, but I never knew the Bishop of Newry at all in any way.

The Rev. JOHN WINTHROP BLACKETT, sworn and examined.

25781 The Chairman.—Do you hold any ecclesiastical appointments?—Yes, my lord, I am the Incumbent of St. James's Church near Bess.

25782. Do you reside there?—Yes, having an official residence also in Dublin.

25783. What is the office which you hold in connexion with the Incorporated Society?—That of secretary.

25784. Where is your office?—73, Haucourt-street, Dublin.

25785. What are your duties as secretary?—My duties are to carry out the orders of the General Board and Committee of the Society, the general management of the correspondence of the Society, the visiting of the schools from time to time according as the Board direct, attending the annual examinations in these schools, and competitive examinations for the admission of pupils to the free places on the foundation, and the general conducting of the affairs of the Society.

25786. Have you anything to do either with receiving the rents of the Society, or arranging its estates?—Nothing whatever.

25787. How many schools are there that you inspect?—We have in all, my lord, eight boarding institutions, six for boys and two for girls, and thirteen day schools wholly or in part supported by the Society.

25788. Where are the first three situated?—One is situated near Dublin, at Santry, our training institution; the other institutions are scattered through Ireland. There is one in Dundalk, one in the county Westmeath, one in Athlone, another in Sligo, and another in Kilkenny. These are our boarding institutions for boys. Then there are two girls' institutions besides, one in Roscommon, the other in Kildare.

25789. When do you train in your training establishment?—Those who are drafted from our other institutions. After they have passed four years in our insti-

tutions in the country they are re-examined; it is by a competitive examination amongst our senior class. From these we select a certain number who are sent to Santry school to receive a more advanced class of education.

25790. How long do they stay at Santry?—From one year to two years.

25791. What becomes of them after?—They are qualified to obtain places perhaps in the Civil Service. They are largely sought for as science teachers in the grammar schools of England, and some are required for our own schools; more find their way into Trinity College, having obtained classical instruction in the school, and from thence very superior scientific education, are enabled to obtain very high places in the University.

25792. Have these boys learned science before coming to Santry?—Some have in our Provincial institutions, but it is of a very elementary character.

25793. At Santry, do you give them a commercial education, or a partially classical and mathematical?—We do not undertake the classical education still, for our Society was incorporated for promoting English Protestant Schools in Ireland. The object is to educate them for commercial situations, and classes have been superadded where the boys expressed a desire for them. I have drawn up a brief statement which contains, I dare say, by anticipation, answers to many of the inquiries that might be made; it is as follows:—

"The schools formerly called Protestant Clerical Schools were incorporated in the year 1793.

"The Society was endowed by annual grant from Parliament, and also received private bequests and donations.

"The Management is by a General Board and Executive Committee of fifteen, chosen out of the members at large."

"The Society consists of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, and Judges, some of the nobility, clergy and gentry of Ireland."

"The Government Grant was finally withdrawn in 1842."

The Rev. John  
Winthrop  
Blackett

and a change in the system of the Society was thus necessitated.

There are now eight Boarding Institutions (six for boys and two for girls), and thirteen Day Schools, wholly or in part supported by the Society.

"About 1,000 children under instruction, viz.—228 Foundation Pupils, boarded, clothed and educated by the Society for a period of four years, 300 other pupils in the schools, consisting of Day-Schoolers (269) and Day Scholars (308), the Day Scholars are received at reduced rates. The Foundation Pupils are elected by competitive examination, with the exception of 30 girls nominated to the Catholic Institution by Thomas Gasfay, Esq. M.P.

"The rules and conditions of the competitive examinations for election of Free Pupils are found in the Paper No. 1 annexed, as also an examination of the several Institutes in Ireland from which candidates may be presented. A certificate required from each candidate, copy of Form annexed (No. 2).

"In the Boys' Institutions, the course of instruction embraces a sound Scriptural and superior English and a liberal education in writing, arithmetic, geography, book-keeping, history, geometry, trigonometry, algebra, drawing, surveying, napping, navigation, &c.

"A Catechism attached to each Institution, shaped with a view of instructing the pupils in the Holy Scriptures and Fundamentals of the United Church of England and Ireland.

"A limited number of Foundation Boys, after four years' residence at the provincial schools, re-elected (by competitive examination) to the Society's Training Institution of Salford. There they enjoy the advantages of a still higher education of a conventional mathematical nature, fitting them (1) for places in the Civil Service, (2) as Science Masters in the Grammar Schools of England, Ireland, and the Colonies. Very many of these pupils may now be found filling high positions as Teachers with distinguished credit to themselves and the Society's Institutions where they were educated.

"The pupils are also qualified for the examinations held under the Royal Dublin Society, the Queens College, and the Science and Art Department, South Kensington, London. Under the last named Institution, four of the Society's pupils obtained Exhibitions of £30 a year for three years, won in competition with candidates from the United Kingdom. In the Department's public examination in Higher Mathematics, the pupils of the Society's schools have gained particularly high distinctions. The only Gold Medal for Elementary Mathematics was awarded (last year) to a pupil of the Society's Institution at Dundalk.

"Some of the pupils have been unusually successful in Public College. Four have obtained Science Scholarships to the high academic prize, the Incorporated Society grant as Exhibitions of £30 per year, to be held for four years, called "the Thackeray Exhibition," in commemoration of the services rendered to the Society's schools by the late Rev. E. Thackeray.

"The benefit of the system of education administered by the Society is felt beyond the limits of the schools immediately under its care. The annual election of Free Pupils by competitive examination, and thus a most beneficial influence is exercised over the schools in which candidates are prepared for this searching test.

"The clergy of the several parishes who send forward the candidates, give their testimony to the useful bearing of this system upon their schoolmasters, mistresses, and pupils.

"During the past year, the competition for two places was carried on in sixteen places throughout Ireland, and all the Scriptural schools in fourteen cities, counties, and in twenty-five districts of six other counties (altogether is all about 118 parishes), were invited to send candidates of their privilege to send forward candidates.

"In the Day Schools under the Society's care, is afforded a sound Scriptural and useful English education, and in the Female Schools, the children are also taught needlework, fitted for domestic servants, and, where properly qualified, trained to be schoolmistresses."

25794. Who are the general members of the society?—His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant is the patron, the Archbishop of Armagh is the vice-patron. All the bishops are ex-officio members. The chief judges and some of the dignitaries are also ex-officio members. Then there is the body elected from time to time according as vacancies occur by the act of the general Board. This consists of the nobility, clergy, and gentry.

25795. Is any qualification necessary or any annual subscription attached to the membership?—Some years ago an annual subscription was essentially necessary to

qualify a member, but the Board have abolished that restriction.

25796. Is the number of members limited?—Yes, to 112, besides twenty-five ex-officio members.

25797. Mr. Stokes—How long have you been secretary?—Since 1858.

25798. Did you succeed the Rev. Richard Andriani?—I did.

25799. Before your appointment as secretary were you a member of the committee of fifteen?—No.

25800. Are you acquainted with the history of the Society?—I am.

25801. You mentioned that the charter was issued in 1733?—Yes.

25802. Do you know what circumstances led to the issue of the charter?—It was by Geo. II., and intended to teach the children of Papists and other poor natives in the English tongue and in the principles of the true religion established amongst us.

25803. I want to know whether you have read and remember that a petition was presented from the archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries of the Established Church in Ireland upon this subject?—Yes. So I am instructed.

25804. Do you recollect that the petition recognises the legal oligarchy which then lay and is supposed still to be upon the bench of clergy in this country to support schools?—Yes; I believe it was implied in it.

25805. Do you remember that the petition states, "That the parish masters had generally endeavoured, and often with some expense to themselves, to provide masters for such schools as the law required them to do, but that the richer Papists refused to send their children to such schools, and the poorer were unable to pay the accustomed salary in the law directed"?—Yes.

25806. Have you any acquaintance with the terms of the charter?—I have read it of course from time to time. It is my duty to be acquainted with it.

25807. Does it state that in many parts of this Kingdom there are great tracts of land almost entirely inhabited by Papists?—Yes.

25808. That the majority of the Papish natives were kept by their clergy in gross ignorance, and had up in great disaffection to the Government, and that the erection of charter schools would be absolutely necessary to their conversion and civilization. These statements are given in the charter?—They are.

25809. Then the charter proceeds to empower the Society to hold property?—Yes.

25810. Is there any hint to the property the Society may hold?—Yes, it was at that limited to about £2,000 a year. There was a short Act passed in, I think, George the Third's reign, enlarging the powers of the Society, and giving it the privilege to hold much larger property.

25811. For what purposes was that property to be held?—For the maintenance of these schools.

25812. Were there to be schoolmasters and schoolmistresses to teach the children of Papists and other poor natives in the English tongue, and in the fundamental principles of the true religion, and to cause them to be instructed in industrial occupations?—Yes, for which this large grant was made by the Government of the day.

25813. Will you be so kind as to specify the sources of the funds of the Society?—They are derived from estates that have been left to the Society, some for specific purposes, some for general purposes, some for particular schools, some for general education, and a sum of money was invested in the funds left to the Society by donors for the same purpose or purposes.

25814. Originally did the King subscribe £1,000 a year?—Yes.

25815. And did the Society enjoy the produce of tax upon hawkers?—Yes.

25816. You say the Parliamentary grants ceased entirely in 1832?—Yes.

25817. Can you give the total sum received?—Not now, but I can supply the Commission with it by referring to our books.

Rev. John Widdows Mackay.

Feb 18, 1868.  
 Rev John  
 Wintthrop  
 Backus

25818 I find it mentioned in the reports of the endowed schools, or previous Commissions, that £1,800,000 was granted to the Incorporated Society for this purpose, I suppose that is the accumulated amount of many years' grants from Parliament—I suppose that total has been reached in that way.

25819 Can you say what property the society now holds?—Between the income derived from the funds and from the landed estates, it is about £8,000 a year.

25820 Does the extent of landed property remain the same as in 1854, that is, 17,246 acres?—It varies somewhat. We have been enabled to purchase and add to it. It varies in a trifling degree, I should say.

25821 Can you say the total acreage now held by the society?—I cannot at this moment. I can supply the information if required. I can apply to the agent, it is not in my department.

25822 There is a large sum in the funds belonging to the society.—Is there not?—Yes.

25823 About £100,000?—About that I suppose. Perhaps a little less.

25824 Upon what trusts does the society hold all this property?—They hold it for educational purposes. I might, perhaps, to say that when the Government grant was withdrawn, it was necessary to restrict the objects of the society within the limits of the private donations that we received, and the bequests made for special purposes. These we have been carrying out as the best way we can.

25825 Is it your opinion that the trust for which the property of the society is held includes the cost of lodging, clothing, and feeding the children?—Yes, originally there were special grants. There was the original Government grant, under which we were restricted to the support of charter schools. That grant being withdrawn, we were thrown upon the particular bequests made for special purposes, and these we have endeavoured to carry out. These that were for general purposes we have been endeavouring to apply in the best manner, according to the judgment of the society.

25826 Is there anything in the charter about paying the cost of lodging, clothing, and feeding?—I am not prepared to say at this moment. The Government grant was applied in support of children in Protestant charter schools. That expense was defrayed by the grant.

25827 Would you say that the object of this expenditure fell within the general term education?—As to boarding-schools, I should say it did, feeding the boys is essential as well as instructing their minds. The pupils were taken from a class destitute of pecuniary means and were supported in an act of charity.

25828 I think you said that on the first institution of the society the children admitted were confined to the sons of Roman Catholic parents?—Not exclusively. I understand that was one of the objects of the charter schools, it was carried out for a great number of years.

25829 Can you give the date of the change?—Yes, since the parliamentary grant was withdrawn in 1832. Then the Board had to consider the best mode of applying the sum of money remaining at their disposal, arising from the estates left to the society, and from the funded property, and then the society devised their scheme, under which they have been carrying out their present very successful system of education.

25830 Down to 1803 were not the benefits of the trusts confined to Roman Catholic children?—Not exclusively, as before explained; there were special bequests for other purposes.

25831 What was the first special bequest the society received?—That I could not answer at this moment. I have named to you some of the bequests, but as regards their chronological order I could not state the priority of one above the other. The Pococke estate in Killybeg was left for special purposes, the estates left by Denis Stewart in the North, and the

Randolph estates in the counties of Roscommon and Westmeath.

25832 And the Conolly estate?—That was a grant from the Conolly family for the school at Coleridge. It was handed over to our society, who implemented the grant from the Conolly family, and enabled the institution to maintain a double number of girls as pupils.

25833 The Randolph grant was probably the oldest?—I think not, an Act of Parliament gave it to us.

25834 Do you remember the bequest by Lord Randolph was made in 1708. He granted estates in Roscommon and Westmeath, the management of which was transferred to your society in 1769?—Yes, in George the Third's reign.

25835 Do you remember the trusts in that case?—It was the maintaining schools in the towns of Roscommon and Athlone, and to pay a certain sum to each of the clergymen of those respective parishes. These are the main objects.

25836 What class of children was contemplated in that trust?—The children of the resident artisans, some parties in that position of life that wanted education, and were not able to obtain it for themselves, and who lived on the estate.

25837 Was not the trust to educate twenty Protestant boys and as many Protestant girls in the two towns?—Yes.

25838 Do you recollect the date of the Pococke bequest?—The object of the Pococke bequest was the maintenance of so many children. They were to be all taught the art of weaving.

25839 Were not the trusts in that case limited to Papist boys?—They were particularly named with the view of having them educated as Protestants.

25840 With regard to the Coleridge institution, what class of children were contemplated in that endowment?—Those nominated by the Conolly family. Whichever they pleased to send to the institution the society was obliged to receive—that is, subject to certain restrictions as regards age, then a certificate of health must be presented. In addition to the thirty children sent in by the Conolly family, the society has thirty-two children more maintained on the foundation.

25841 In that case under the original endowment must not the children admitted be members of the Established Church?—They must, all of them, be educated as such. Our charter imposes that condition.

25842 Do you remember the exact time of the change made with regard to the class of children to be admitted?—I am not aware.

25843 Down to 1803 the children admitted was the sons of Roman Catholics. In 1803 I think you said the society made a change?—I am not conscious of having said so. I am ignorant exactly of what had occurred in 1808. I am not at this moment prepared to answer the question as to what took place in 1803.

25844 Are you aware from your records that the society resolved at that time to admit children under no other restriction than what is imposed by the charter?—I am not prepared to say more than what appears on record in our books, of poor natives of Ireland.

25845 What restrictions were in fact imposed by the charter?—That they were to be the children of Roman Catholics in Ireland, and the object was to rescue them from the errors of the Roman Catholic system, and bring them up as members of the Established Church.

25846 According to the terms of the charter were not the children to be the children of "Papist and other poor natives of Ireland"?—Yes; that is the very language of the charter.

25847 Did your society within your knowledge take the opinion of the Attorney-General in 1829, whether Roman Catholic children might legally be received in the Incorporated Society's schools without being taught Protestantism?—I cannot answer that question. I am not quite prepared to do so.

25843. The Rev. Mr. Ardill, I think, gave in evidence that it was the opinion of the Attorney-General that Catholic children admitted to the schools must be taught Protestantism?—That is the principle upon which the society still conducts the schools. They cannot depart from that principle.

25844. When did the society cease to receive Roman Catholic children into their schools?—Change took place in 1832. When the Government grant was withdrawn the society had no means of carrying on the large number of schools which they previously had, and were obliged to restrict their operations within proportional limits. At this moment they are prepared to receive Roman Catholic children, and some do come, but then they must submit to be instructed as members of the United Church of England and Ireland. We have no power to teach them in any other way.

25845. It is said in the Endowed Schools Commission Report that since 1825 the schools have been for Protestant children only. Is that so?—I should say, with some exceptions, that has been so.

25846. When did you introduce admission by competition?—After 1832.

25847. Was it not in 1839?—Yes; it was in 1839.

25848. What conditions do you impose upon the candidates for admission now?—They are selected by competitive examination. The regulations are stated in this paper.

25849. I don't refer to the examination; but to the preliminary conditions. What children may offer themselves for examination?—Any children whatsoever may come forward, subject to these limitations, namely, that the boys shall not be under twelve, or above sixteen years of age, and the girls not under ten, or above fourteen; that they must have been in attendance at a National school within the prescribed districts for at least one year previous to the day of examination, with certificates of age and moral conduct, signed by the clergymen of the parishes in which the candidate has been educated, as also of health, signed by a medical practitioner.

25850. Does that condition that the children are to come from schools where the Bible is read by all pupils exclude pupils from the National schools?—Not necessarily, because we do receive children from the National schools, where this certificate can be signed. The certificate is to vouch age, that the candidate attended a school, where the Holy Scriptures were daily read during the last twelve months, that certificate is signed and sent to us from some National schools.

25851. Then the only National schools excluded would be those attended by some Catholic children?—It does not depend upon whether they are Roman Catholics or Protestants. They may be all Roman Catholics—if the Holy Scriptures are daily read by all the children, they may come as candidates.

25852. Are you not aware, as a matter of fact, that Roman Catholic children in National schools do not daily read the Holy Scriptures?—Yes, I am, but even in some of those schools it is the fact the Holy Scriptures have been read by them. There is one school in the county Louth from which we have selected children, also from a National school in the county Kilkenny; there have been competitors from these schools who have been successful at our examinations, and admitted into our institutions. I hope I have made myself clear, that a National school is not excluded from participating in the Society's benefits because it is a National school. If a certificate be given on the terms prescribed, there is nothing to prevent a child from a National school coming and sitting with the other candidates at a competitive examination.

25853. Is the answer given by the Rev. J. W. Stubbs a correct representation of the present practice of the Endowed Society—that if a Protestant boy be admitted at a National school, where there are Roman Catholic children, which Roman Catholic children are not allowed to read the Scriptures, that boy, no matter what his ability or gifts may be, would not be eligible

for election?—The certificate I have read for you implies that.

25854. So that it would be in the power of any Roman Catholic patron, or of children attending a National school, to exclude from the benefits of your schools all the Protestant children attending it?—If a child were admitted into the school, and refused to read the Scriptures, it would necessarily prevent the clergyman from signing the certificate essential to candidature.

25855. Have you any day school in Dublin?—We have in Augher street.

25856. What is the character of the school?—It is intended for the benefit of children who are not able to pay a large sum for education. For £4 a year we invite them to come to the school, where they get a very excellent English education, primary, as well as a little more advanced in those subjects already named—writing, arithmetic, geography, grammar, history, mathematics, Enoch, algebra, &c. From that school we select, at an examination which we hold, one boy for our institutions in the year, giving him the benefit of being boarded, lodged, and educated in our schools for four years.

25857. Is that school intended for the benefit of middle-class boys?—Yes.

25858. Are all the boys in the school Protestants?—We have had occasionally some Roman Catholics.

25859. Are Presbyterian children admitted to that school?—Yes.

25860. You said that in your boarding-schools there were some paying boys?—Yes.

25861. What do they pay?—That is a matter between the masters and the parents or guardians of the boys. All the restriction we impose, as regards the price, for our society pays a very large sum towards the expense and support of the school. We have restricted the master, in order to enable boys to take advantage of the education there. The sum named is £20 a year. It was £14 10s. Since I became secretary, we had to raise it gradually, in consequence of the increasing prices of provisions.

25862. What do they pay at Bantley?—£25. In consequence of £20 not being adequate for the dietary, we allow the master now to charge £25—that is for the class called boarders. Then there is a class called pauper boarders. Their payment is the subject of a specific arrangement between the master and the parents or guardians.

25863. Do you limit the master to a certain number of paying pupils?—No. In consequence of the donations giving great accommodation, when we were restricted by the withdrawal of the grant, we were desirous of giving an opportunity to boys to avail themselves of the unoccupied donations.

25864. What class in society do these boys belong to?—To classes of a mixed character. Some are the sons of clergymen, others the members of very respectable families of the gentry of limited means. Then again for the artisan class who wish to get their boys an advanced education, and at a very reduced rate, £30—they are dieted and educated for that. The expense of assistant masters is paid by our society. Thus the master is enabled to take pupils at such a reduced rate, and afford them the advantages of board and instruction.

25865. Amongst the boarders in your schools are there any Roman Catholics?—None. I don't know of any.

25866. The Rev. Mr. Ardill mentioned in his evidence before the Endowed School Commission a case of one Roman Catholic boy in the school at Dandalk. He was asked—"Is that a child of Roman Catholic parents, but nevertheless a child receiving Protestant instruction, and attending Divine worship in a Protestant Church every Sunday, and in every respect conforming to the doctrines and principles of the Protestant Church?" He answered—"Yes, in every respect." Have you any cases of that kind now?—I am not aware at this moment that there are.

25867. I think you said the general tenets of your

Feb. 12, 1868.

Rev. John  
Watthrop  
Hackett

Feb. 23, 1869.  
 J. V. John  
 Witness  
 Black & Co.

society are for children of Papak and other poor natives to be taught the English tongue, husbandry, and trades?—That was the original charter.

25873 Do you not hold your property under that charter?—The Government grant we received in consequence of that charter. We are enabled to hold land to which specific purposes are attached. Many of these grants we received from private individuals for supporting certain schools in certain districts, which we are obliged to conform to.

25874 Except from the charter have you any legal power to hold your 17,000 acres of land?—None whatsoever, but by charter and other Parliamentary enactments. Under these we received the bequests. It is not only for the natives, but for others also.

25875 Other poor children?—Just so.

25876 In your opinion is the principal object of the trust to benefit the children, or to maintain the Protestant form of religion?—I should suppose it is to benefit the children by educating them in that form of religion. I cannot separate the two objects.

25877 When the general trusts of the society are limited to children of Papak and other poor natives, and that the Boarding Trusts are for Protestant children, and the Conventual Trusts for children of the Established Church, and the Poor Law Trust for poor Papak natives, is it your opinion that one and the same class of children is contemplated in all these cases?—Certainly not; there is a specification of distinct classes of trusts in these cases, for instance, some are to maintain certain schools in certain places, and that we do.

25878 Do you admit more than one class of children into your schools?—Yes, various classes, as before stated.

25879 Do you admit into your schools children of more than one religion?—Certainly if they conform to the rule, which is an essential condition of the charter—that they are to be instructed in the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland.

25880 Do you think that when Bishop Doane left his property for poor Papaks, and Lord Rensleigh his for poor Protestants, that the same sort of children were contemplated?—Yes, under the common condition that they were to be educated as members of the Established Church.

25881 Is not the limitation in each case to poor children?—That was what the charter schools were intended for, and those impoverished by particular circumstances were under that classification. Some of the Irish clergy and gentry, unable to educate their children, were most anxious to take advantage of the education afforded by the Society at so small a payment. I presume, under the circumstances, they might be considered perhaps as being within the class contemplated.

25882 Are you of opinion that the society observes the trusts in favour of the poor?—Certainly; I think any schools we have originated are for such classes; for instance, the day school in Dublin is for the children of persons of moderate incomes.

25883 Does your society in any of the schools teach husbandry or trades, as is provided for under the charter and Bishop Doane's bequest?—Not now, they were obliged to abandon that on the failure of the experiment. Two of the schools were intended for that purpose; but the Agricultural schools of Ireland, established by the Government grant, gave advantage in this respect that we could not compete with, and we were obliged to abandon the idea of teaching agriculture to the boys.

25884 Can you say what trial was made to teach agriculture?—For many years it was tried at the Farm and Experiment-charge schools. We could not compete with the public society in giving such an education as would enable the boys to obtain a livelihood.

25885 What recommendations, in your opinion, do boarding schools for poor children possess?—I think there are none of the parents, for instance, who could not possibly support their boys, to whom we give that advantage if they obtain the places at public competitions. They present themselves at the examination,

and we select the best answers; and the humblest boy in the land has the same chance of succeeding in the examination as the children of persons in a better position.

25886 Why not allow them to live at home with their parents, and teach them in day schools?—They could not all command the advantages of education at home; at some places they would be taken from schools except expensive schools.

25887 Are your schools carried on partly with the intention of providing small Protestant ministers with the means of education in places where their numbers would not enable them to support a school of their own denomination?—I dare say without being so contemplated in some parts of the country the present arrangement has that effect. It is a great loss in consequence of its reaching a distressed class.

25888 Do you remember that the Report of the Commission, which preceded this education inquiry, condemned boarding schools?—I believe it did, and the original charter schools, which were continued were suppressed at the time the grant was withdrawn from us. They did not lead to the beneficial results at first expected.

25889 Would this statement appear to you inaccurate?—

"We are convinced that if 1,000 children, educated in charter schools, were to be compared with an equal number who had remained in the apparently wretched cabins, inhabited by their parents, but who had attended a daily and well-regulated day school, it would be found not only that the latter had passed their years of instruction far more happily to themselves, but that when arrived at the age of manhood they would, upon a general average, be in every respect more valuable and better instructed members of society, they would have improved in knowledge under circumstances which would have strengthened and confirmed their connection with all those to whom they must naturally look for protection and assistance, and would enter upon life with their affections awakened, their principles confirmed, and their character raised by the reliance they would have learned to place in their own exertions, and in the justice they would have acquired of controlling and conducting themselves."

Does that preference which the Commission express for day schools over boarding schools cohere with your experience?—I think if I understood rightly the paragraph you have just read, it has reference to the old charter schools and not to the present class of boarding schools. I think experience fully bears out the observations in that paragraph with regard to the charter schools, but I could not at all assent to it as referring to the present existing boarding schools.

25890 Does your approval of boarding schools imply that boarders educated came from a better social class?—Not necessarily. The humblest artisan's child may succeed, and has succeeded. The children of prize men and soldiers very often succeed in obtaining the prizes at our competitive examinations and are drafted into our boarding schools. They have sometimes attained very high positions in society.

25891 What would you say were the difference between what you call the charter schools and those schools which the Incorporated Society now support?—From all I can gather from the history of the charter schools, they were subject to great abuses, the consequence was the children were very much neglected as regards education, and the reports which I have in the records of the Incorporated Society, show that there were most serious grounds of complaint against the masters and trustees of those schools with reference to their neglect of the children. The suppression of the charter schools, I should think, arose from these successive reports of this neglect and the injurious consequences. As regards the present boarding schools, they are managed on such different principles, and are attended with such beneficial and useful effects as to be in perfect contrast with the charter schools. Their superiority is manifest to anyone who examines them. The boys who have issued from them have gained some high prizes at competitive examinations for places in the Civil Service and other public departments; others



are filling positions as science teachers in some of the grammar schools in England.

25932 To what do you attribute the difference, and the change for the better?—I think now they enjoy the wonderful care of kind friends. In our boarding schools the pupils meet together; they are happy; they are associated with the master and his family; and kindly sympathies are created which were rather discouraged under the old charter school system.

25933 Was not the management identical?—Quite otherwise.

25934 What change has taken place?—I believe masters were appointed to them by the influence of patronage for the more benefit of the master, a very unimportant person sometimes, and regarded his school charge too much as a private speculation for his own benefit. All this led to the abuses which brought about the suppression of the schools.

25935 Was not the Lord Lieutenant all along the president of the society, and was it not managed by dignitaries of the Church?—They were always members of the Board of Governors.

25936 Was not one object of the foundation of the society to promote loyalty?—Yes.

25937 So far as the system of competition you have explained excludes candidates from National schools, would you not say that opposition to the system of education, founded by the Imperial Government, is rather an obstacle to the disaffection it was one object of the charter to remove?—That is rather a testing question. Many, judging from the results of the National school system, prefer the Scriptural education of the pupils in our schools, as being calculated to secure in a more certain manner loyalty to an earthly Government, though the higher loyalty owed to the King of Kings.

25938 Did I not understand you to say that one of the objects for which you laid this property is the promotion of loyalty?—Certainly, but it is not so much because we differ from the Government that we should be disloyal to our Queen.

25939 Would you yourself say that the exclusion of Roman Catholics from your schools, or their admission at the cost of their faith, is likely to promote loyalty amongst Popish natives, who form the greater part of the population?—I am of opinion that their admission to our schools and the benefits of our system of education, and under the condition you term a sacrifice, would be likely to promote their loyalty, and we fulfil the condition. Disapproval of the National system of education does not necessarily imply disloyalty to our Queen.

25940 Is it not matter of notoriety amongst the natives of this country, that Roman Catholics are excluded from your schools, or if admitted, that they must sacrifice their religion?—Our charter would not allow them to become members of our schools without being instructed in the principles of the Established Church.

25941 Do you think it likely that that state of things can promote loyalty amongst the Roman Catholics of Ireland?—I cannot understand why it would affect their loyalty or disloyalty, any more than the exclusion from strictly Roman Catholic schools would affect Protestant loyalty or disloyalty.

25942 You hold estates in several counties in Ireland?—Yes.

25943 Will you tell me what is done for the education of the people on these estates?—Upon these estates, many of the schools are founded. We also afford opportunities to the various Scriptural schools throughout these districts to send in candidates to the competitive examinations. It is usually from these the boarders are selected.

25944 Is anything done for the Roman Catholic natives who cultivate these estates?—Is it in the way of education?

25945 Yes!—In the way of education nothing further than what we have done by offering the education which alone we can give under the charter.

25946 The Chairman.—Do you value to any

National schools or promote any National schools under the Board on your estates?—We do not.

25947 Mr. Stale.—The Roman Catholic children upon your estates must come to the Protestant schools or go without education, is that the case?—Certainly, so far as our schools are concerned.

25948 Have you established any regular inspection of your schools?—Yes, a deputation from our society is appointed every year, and on annual inspection is made by that deputation. I go myself occasionally as secretary to visit these schools. I inspect the institution to see that matters are in order, then members of our board occasionally visit the schools, and report to us anything they might find to require correction.

25949 On a previous inquiry a complaint was made against your society, that there was no regular efficient inspection; have you modified that system?—Yes.

25950 You have made the inspection more strict and regular?—Yes, and more frequent.

25951 Who appoints the committee of fifteen which manages?—The board at the February meeting. By charter this was arranged. Two sub-committees are appointed—the sub-committee for accounts and the sub-committee of deputation. These are all named at the annual meeting of the society in February—it has just taken place.

25952 Is the committee of fifteen responsible to any larger body?—Yes, to the board; they are charged with the executive duties. They are appointed to carry out the orders of the board. They have a monthly meeting. The board assembles quarterly.

25953 Do they report to the board?—Yes.

25954 Are reports published of the proceedings or accounts of the society?—No.

25955 Are such reports presented to Parliament?—No, we have no Parliamentary grant.

25956 What local management is there to superintend your schools?—The local management is by the school and local committee, constituted by some friends living immediately in the vicinity, and who occasionally inspect the schools. They have no authority to make any changes; these must be done by the committee or the board. They can only offer suggestions.

25957 Do you employ catechists?—Yes, there is a catechist to each of our institutions.

25958 Who are these gentlemen?—The clergyman of the parish generally.

25959 Do you pay them?—Yes, £20 a year.

25960 Is order that the children of the schools shall receive religious instruction in a way satisfactory to the board, do you find it necessary to pay a clergyman?—Yes, I think we do. We have greater authority over him, more control over him, and I think the duty is perhaps discharged more regularly.

25961 Would you say from your experience that in other classes of schools where religious instruction is desirable, in such cases also it would be well to allow something to clergymen to look after the religious instruction in a way which would make them responsible for it to those who pay them?—I do not think that our clergy would exactly refuse to accept some addition to their small salaries throughout the country; but our catechists are charged with other duties besides those of a religious character. They have to look after the institution itself. They must superintend the expenses of it, and sanction the bill of account before we pay them; therefore, the accounts of the master must be first passed by the catechists; so that the catechists have other duties to perform besides the imparting of religious instruction in the schools, for which they receive that small pay.

25962 Do you know enough about National schools to say whether the managers of National schools discharge the duties which you require your catechists to discharge? Do they stand in relation to the National school in the same position that your catechists occupy in relation to your schools?—I am not quite prepared to answer your question. I know the late archbishop of Dublin paid a catechist for his attention to the instruction of the Protestant children.

Feb. 19, 1869

Rev. John  
Wainwright  
Blackburn.

Feb. 19, 1862.

Rev John  
Westrop  
Hackett

in the model schools in Marlborough-street. I don't know anything more about it.

25923. Do your catechists report regularly to your committee?—Yes, their visits to the schools are all entered in a book, and then we receive an extract from them as to their visits to the schools. They are generally quarterly.

25924. How are your teachers appointed?—Frequently by the committee of fifteen, which consists of some of the Fellows of Trinity College. These masters are sometimes submitted to examinations. They are more frequently those who have been brought up in connexion with our own society, and the Fellows of College knowing them for years are at once prepared to pronounce upon their competency to take charge of schools.

25925. Are they subjected to any examination?—At times they are, at times not, for instance, a gentleman from Durham College was submitted for examination. We were not of course aware of his ability save from the certificate he presented.

25926. How are your teachers paid?—By a salary. If there is a deal connected with the school, we let it at a moderate rent. We give an allowance for servants, pay all rents and taxes, allow an assistant teacher or teachers, and various allowances which lighten the burthen upon them; and then we require them to receive the class of pay boarders at the reduced rate alluded to.

25927. Can you mention the minimum and maximum rates of payment to the masters?—It is, generally speaking, on an average, £100 a year, sometimes less, in consequence of the land making a difference, or the changes in the schools, for instance, a larger or a smaller number of boys in a school would vary the amount of salary.

25928. Do you remember the recommendations made in reference to the Schools of the Incorporated Society by the Commissioners of 1857?—I cannot say that I do. I know none of the recommendations of the last Commission. I looked upon the former as quite obsolete.

25929. After recommending the suppression of the charter schools, they state—“It will then be for the Society to judge in what manner they can most usefully apply the large revenues attached to them.” Do you see any reason why the funds held by the Society could not be devoted to the maintenance of day schools, and placed under the direction of the Board of National Education?—I do not think the Board of National Education could carry them on strictly in accordance with our charter. The question of religious instruction would, I should suppose, be especially an impediment in the way of the National Board taking charge of our schools.

25930. Supposing Parliament were to annul as to relieve you of the obligation of restricting the admission to the schools to one particular class, and that the minority of the inhabitants of Ireland, would you approve of that change?—Personally I should not, I don't know what our Board would say.

25931. Supposing the following three ways of bringing the action of the Incorporated Society into harmony with the general plan of education were submitted to you, I should like to know which you would prefer:—Boarding schools to be maintained as now, exclusively for Protestants; but preference given to Protestant children from localities where the Protestant population is too small to maintain a separate school. Secondly, or the boarding schools may be thrown open to persons of all religions and instructed in schools of agriculture and handicraft, as contemplated in the charter. Thirdly, or the estates may be disposed of and the funds handed over to the Government department of education, for general use, subject to the obligation of maintaining schools at Athlone, Roscommon, Colbridge, and Killybegs—Which of these systems would you prefer?—Of course, it comes before me so suddenly that I am not prepared to go into the whole range of the question—but, if I understand you rightly, I prefer the present system under which our boarding schools have been managed. I

seriously should prefer the maintenance of the present system to the adoption of either of the other two. The first alternative would contemplate the maintenance of the schools just as at present, strictly separate Protestant schools, with admission to them offered to children coming from these places where Protestants are so few in number, that there is no hope of their maintaining a separate school of their own. This course would tend to surmount a difficulty from which those minorities may suffer with regard to the majority of children living in such places. But there is no difficulty so far as I understand the question as regards the present system, for we do take children from remote districts according as they may belong to the privileged parts of Ireland.

25932. Do you see any objection to giving a preference to those children?—I do not myself see any very great reason to object to it; our Board might do it to-morrow. They might take in those places if they pleased. They have full power to do so without requiring an Act of Parliament at all to enable them to make the alteration, and I think they have been governed by that opinion in enlarging the area from whence they have been receiving children within the last few years. In taking into consideration neglected districts through Ireland, and where the children have not the same advantages as in other places; the Board have been governed by a wish to meet that anomaly.

25933. Has not that principle been quite lost sight of in the establishment of a middle class school in Dublin?—On the contrary I think it is in perfect harmony with it inasmuch as there are families in Dublin so destitute of the means of proper education for children as they could possibly be in remote parts of the country.

25934. You spoke of Santry school?—It appears from the records of your society that one object contemplated at Santry was the training of schoolmasters?—Yes.

25935. Is there any particular reason why Santry school should not be made a denominational training school for Protestant schoolmasters?—I do not see any myself. It is the object for which it was instituted, but our funds are so restricted that we cannot take in more than a small number.

25936. Supposing Government were to offer you a grant in recognition of the area which you already expend at Santry for the very purpose of training Protestant schoolmasters, would you see any objection to accepting such a proposal as that?—A grant from Parliament might be restricted on an appropriation to certain conditions, and thus rendered unavailing towards attaining the object which our system of education has in view.

25937. How many schoolmasters are now trained at Santry?—Generally from twenty to twenty-four at the foundation, but the number is at this time considerably diminished by the constant demand for them as science teachers in Ireland and in the grammar schools of England, and by successes at competitive examinations for Civil Service situations.

25938. Do the young men from Santry find it easier to obtain places in England than in Ireland?—They readily find situations in both countries.

25939. Is there any class of schools in Ireland which you design to supply with schoolmasters?—Not any particular class. The boys choose for themselves, according as the opportunities offer. I may be permitted to say that this morning I received from the Department of Science and Art at South Kensington a very gratifying report as regards Santry. You are aware the Science and Art Department hold examinations over the whole kingdom, and the report which arrived informs me that of our Santry pupils, only who were under instruction—that is, the pay boarders, also our own foundation scholars as well, received eighty-seven prizes at the last examination, whereas there were only two schools in England obtained a larger number. These were the Bristol Trade school, where there were 145 under examination, and they obtained 106 prizes, and the Battersea Training College,

where eighty were under instruction, and they got twenty-eight prizes.

25940. What was the amount paid by the Science and Art Department to your schools?—A very large sum indeed.

25941. What becomes of that grant?—It goes to the master. The master at Searby had a claim for nearly £300, in consequence of the pupils having answered in a very distinguished manner at the last examination.

25942. Mr. Saffron.—Are you aware whether the classes at Searby in connection with the Science and Art Department were instructed during school hours, or whether they had extra hours?—There are some of the classes instructed, I think, after, and some during the school time. It is by an arrangement, a report of which is made to the Science and Art Department at South Kensington.

25943. Mr. Stokes.—Do you think that the possibility of earning such a large sum from the Science and Art Department, £300, as against a salary of £100, is a temptation to the master to neglect the ordinary subjects of education and devote himself to those in which the Science and Art Department examine?—I am afraid it might prove to be a temptation, but I anticipate the master of yielding to it. It is certainly a great reward, but I do not think the inducement leads him to neglect his specified duties.

25944. Mr. Deane.—With regard to the Farm school in Westmeath—did you not at one time profess to teach agriculture on land attached to that school?—Yes, but the arrangement ceased some years since.

25945. How long is it since that arrangement was taken up?—Perhaps about six or seven years. I could accurately answer by referring back to the Society's books, but not being prepared for the question, I have not the exact time on my mind. I think it is about six or seven years.

25946. What was the reason for giving up the teaching of agriculture there?—We found it quite a failure because the Government schools prepared a class of boys compared with whom our boys were but imperfectly instructed. We, being limited in funds, were incapable of having such machinery or affording such advantages or opportunities as the Government schools supplied, and therefore our boys were inferior to those from the Government schools. No one would accept them as stewards.

25947. You speak of Government agricultural schools?—Yes.

25948. Do you consider it was the successful training given in the Government agricultural schools that brought about the failure of the teaching at Farna?—Yes, and the persons coming from the Scotch schools. Our boys could not for one moment stand against such a weight of competition.

25949. Did you contemplate in your agricultural schools the merely training persons to be stewards or training the sons of farmers to be themselves farmers?—Both, but I think principally the training of lads to make their way in the world as stewards, however they were utterly incapable of competing with boys from the Government schools.

25950. During the time that Farna establishment was maintained as an agricultural school, what was the arrangement made with regard to the working the land, and disposing of the profits?—The profits (if any) would have belonged to the society, but the expenditure exceeded the returns.

25951. What is done with the land now?—The land now is let to the master at a certain acreable rent, for which he accounts to the society, and these funds are thrown into the general funds of the society, and applied to the maintenance of the school.

25952. Have you any means of judging whether there are more profits derived from the farm now than there were when they were to be handed over to the society?—Do you mean under the late arrangement?

25953. Yes!—The profits are greater now. The land is better cultivated. The boys who were put to

dig on the land could scarcely manage it as skilful labourers would.

25954. At that time was there a regular Dr. and Cr. account kept in the farm?—Yes.

25955. Did the society furnish the funds?—Yes.

25956. And expected the profits?—And expected the profits that were made.

25957. But did not get them?—There were some to be received.

25958. The Chairman.—What extent of land does the master hold at Farna school?—I think about 40 acres.

25959. Then holding this farm what sort of school does he keep?—He is the master of our boarding institution; has the charge of the boys and the under masters, who want him, and he has the management of so many boarders as we send him, and of any other private boarders that may come to him.

25960. What induces the society to allow the master of a boarding-school to hold so much land as 40 acres?—It assists him in supplying the institution with milk, butter, potatoes, vegetables. We think it is of advantage to the master. He has large expenses thrown on him, and this assists him.

25961. Do you imagine he makes more money out of the land than he would get if the land were let, and the rent given to him?—I should suppose he finds it more beneficial to have the land in the way he holds it. It supplies vegetables and milk for the pupils, and gives him more advantages than if he had to purchase these things in the market.

25962. Is it not a great temptation to neglect the children, the fact of his holding so large a quantity of land?—It is, and we should be culpable if we allowed it to interfere with his school duties.

25963. Mr. Deane.—I believe the farm is in gravel?—The greater part is in gravel.

25964. Mr. Stokes.—How many girls are there in the boarding-school?—We have 20 in Roscommon, and 65 in Colmudge.

25965. What becomes of them when they leave your schools?—Some who seem to have a particular aptitude for teaching, and have talent, are trained as schoolmistresses. They generally become survey governesses, or domestic servants.

25966. Do you provide for them in any way, such as by giving them marriage portions?—No, we make a little cashy upon them, according to good conduct and character, when going to their places.

25967. Are they allowed to return to you if they leave their places?—We receive them, should they not have a home; the mistresses make an arrangement for a girl if she comes back for a short time to receive her. This is on the master's own private account.

25968. What class of schools do these young women who become schoolmistresses take service in?—They go to parochial schools in Ireland. Some go to England.

25969. These parochial schools are under the Church Education Society?—Some are and some not.

25970. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—It seems to me that the original trust was intended for the benefit of Roman Catholics chiefly—can you say they are receiving the benefits now?—Those benefits were contemplated, I presume, in connection with the Government grant that we received at that time. That having ceased, we felt ourselves bound to administer the estates and funded property that were given to us—in connexion with, or as near as possible to the specific purposes for which they were given. We give the benefit to Roman Catholics, if they choose to avail themselves of it.

25971. In that there is a certain fallacy, because you say, "if they choose to avail themselves of it," that is, in fact, if they come to be Roman Catholics?—Certainly.

25972. Therefore it is not for the benefit of Roman Catholics as such, but for the benefit of Roman Catholics who become Protestants?—That is in strict accordance with the Charter. The Charter never contemplated our educating Roman Catholics as Roman Catholics. It was to educate as Protestants those who had been originally Roman Catholics. I think, if I

Feb 19, 1869  
—  
Rev. John  
Wentworth  
Hickett

understood you rightly, you implied—at least as far as I could gather from your words—that we were bound to educate them as Roman Catholics. If this were your impression it is not correct.

25973. You have no such corresponding class now as Roman Catholics who avail themselves of your advantages?—There have been a few since the Charter schools have ceased. Roman Catholics have applied; very few, however. But when they enter the school, just as in George the Second's day, they are educated as Protestants.

25974. My impression is that your original trust was to educate Roman Catholics in Protestant principles?—Yes, and other natives.

25975. You found that Roman Catholics would not come to be educated in Protestant principles, and so you educate Protestants?—They did come in very large numbers when we had the charter schools. The suppression of the charter schools hanted us to the other trusts, and these we endeavored to administer as justly and usefully as we can.

25976. I understand you to admit that every acre of land you have you hold under your charter, and subject to the trusts of the charter?—Yes, but the lands are subject to the specific trusts connected with them when received them. For instance, the Randalgh estate is subject to a trust of a perfectly different character from that upon which we received the Government grant, and which we were obliged to administer in full conformity with the requirements of the charter. Other estates, which came to us with specific trusts, we are obliged to administer in accordance with these several trusts.

25977. I understand that a considerable portion of the property is distinctly for the education of Protestant children, but practically it seems to me, from your evidence, the whole of your property is applied, with a few exceptions, to the benefit of Protestant children. Therefore, merely looking at it as a question of trust, it seems to me you have mixed up two different purposes, and it has come to pass that property left for the benefit of Roman Catholics, has come to be almost exclusively used for the benefit of Protestants?—It was not in Roman Catholics as such, it was to make them Protestants. We are quite prepared to do that now, if we possibly can. It was not really for Roman Catholics, as Roman Catholics, but for the encouragement of Protestantism.

25978. Mr. Stiles.—You have said that formerly there was no difficulty in getting Roman Catholic children prepared to become Protestants: is that in accordance with the history of the charter schools?—The children that were mainly placed in our charter schools were of a class of children under the control and authority, generally speaking, of Protestant patrons. Our charter schools were exposed to great abuses in many respects, and the suppression of that system was thought to be most desirable.

25979. It appeared as early as 1757, the people were unwilling under such circumstances to part with their children, and next was difficult to fill the schools except in times of scarcity, the society took to building houses that a supply of children might be obtained, was not that the case?—Yes.

25980. Was not the society obliged to establish a connexion with the founding hospital to obtain children?—I cannot answer that question specifically, for I am not aware of the fact.

25981. Rev. Mr. Corrie.—I should like to ask you whether you would consider it a harsh proceeding if it were assumed your trusts had failed, and that therefore the Legislature could deal fully with your funds?—I don't think we have failed in carrying out the trusts.

25982. Mr. Stiles.—You spoke of a restricted area. What is the restriction upon the area from which you take your candidates?—At first it was intended the area should be restricted to within the limits of the districts where our property was situated.

25983. That is as to the trust property?—Yes.

25984. Did that arise from the express terms of the trust, or was it a condition added by yourselves?—

Entirely added by ourselves, because the moneys given for general educational purposes were distributed in the way I have named. Then we have enlarged the area. We have taken in districts, where, some inquiry was excited amongst Roman Catholics, as, for instance, in Kerry and other Irish Society districts. We have thrown open the invitation to compete for places in the districts where religious inquiry has been successfully prevailing amongst Roman Catholics. We think that this is carrying out very much the original intention of the charter.

25985. Do you see any good reason for restricting your districts in that way—why not throw open the advantages of your schools to all Ireland?—It is the wish of our Board to enlarge the area, but our funds being limited it was thought that by spreading them over too wide a surface we could not do as much good as by restricting them within certain bounds. But I have no doubt our Board would be quite willing to enlarge the area when opportunity offered.

25986. Were not the children in the charter schools placed there in infancy?—Yes, very often, and are obliged to be apprenticed for them.

25987. Consequently, being brought up there they could not at any time have known the influence of a home education?—Just so.

25988. At what ages do the children generally come to you?—If you mean the foundation pupils, we receive the boys between twelve and sixteen years of age, and the girls between ten and fourteen.

25989. The boys not younger than twelve?—Yes, that is the class out of which we select the boarders.

25990. Do not these considerations afford an answer to one of Mr. Stiles's questions, why was it that the charter school system was a demoralising system. A boy who has been at home with father and mother and amongst brothers and sisters up to twelve years of age is likely to become a more moral member of society than a person who was in a school from infancy, and never knew the effects of a home?—That, of course, is my feeling; the boys go home once a year to see their parents. They are permitted to visit their families in summer-time.

25991. It is pretty much the same thing as boarding schools in England for the upper classes?—Quite so. It is exactly upon the same principle. It is done with a view to give the poorer classes the benefits enjoyed by the higher classes in boarding schools.

25992. Suppose the Government were to train up Roman Catholic children as Protestants, must not the individuals who decided these trusts have had naturally a supreme regard for the Protestant religion?—Certainly.

25993. If then it becomes an impossibility to carry that trust out fairly, which then of those two systems would be nearest to the intention of the founder—to advance the cause of the Protestant religion by giving a good training to Protestant children, or applying the money to the giving a Roman Catholic education to Roman Catholic children?—I should think the first, for the main object of the founder was to promote Protestantism through the country.

25994. Can there be a doubt the founder would have wholly abstained from giving these funds for education if they believed they were to be applied in educating children in the Roman Catholic religion?—Certainly. I don't think anything would have been substituted. It would have been against the very essence of the charter and the whole system laid down in that charter.

25995. You have heard of the Chancery doctrine of administering a fund *per se*?—I have heard it, but I don't understand it technically.

25996. When circumstances make it impossible to carry out the intention of a testator, the fund is administered as nearly as possible in accordance with these intentions. Which would be the more *per se* administration of these funds, the way in which *per se* society is at present administering them, or the way Mr. Corrie suggests?—Our system would, in my judgment. But I have higher authority than my opinion. The question was brought before the Court

of Chancery in a case in which a family alleged that the trust for which a certain property was given to our society had failed, and they claimed to have the property given back. The case came before Lord Plunket, who said, "No, I shall do no such thing. The society are doing the nearest thing they possibly can to the intention of the founder, though they cannot strictly carry out the original intention."

25997. What was the name of the case do you remember?—It was the Incorporated Society v. Rose. The question was moved by a family named Rose in the county Tipperary.

25998. Mr. O'Brien.—Supposing the National Board were selected as being able to carry out that doctrine, and that Protestant children were sent to the National schools—do you not think a catechist could give the religious instruction required?—He could give the more catechetical instruction in one school-room as well as in another—but this is only a part of the duties of our catechists—but interferes with our whole system of education. They are the champions of the institutions. They watch over the morals of the boys.

25999. Does the catechist live in the institution?—No; but he is the representative of our Society there. It is to him we refer for information about the school.

26000. What is your training staff in Santry school—how many teachers have you?—We have a head master, with assistants.

26001. What does he teach?—All the high branches of science, he teaches classes; he is competent also to instruct in French.

26002. Is there no tutor for classics?—No; we do not contemplate classes—but the master affords the opportunity to those willing to enhance it.

26003. How many?—Two.

26004. Are they also classical and mathematical?—One is classical. I think the head master takes altogether the instruction in classics. It is not contemplated by the Society to give a classical education. If it were we should have a staff prepared for it.

26005. You said classes were superadded—I wish to know how?—It was a pensioner given to the master when some boys expressed a wish to get instruction in Latin and Greek to prepare them to enter

Trinity College. The Board were applied to for that pensioner, and the pensioner was given.

26006. Mr. Stokes.—At what age, in your opinion, should the children of papists and other poor natives leave school and betake themselves to work?—I suppose when properly developed physically—able to use the implements of agriculture, with respect to employment in husbandry.

26007. Do you not think, looking to the kind of education those children require, that it should be terminated about twelve years of age?—Judging from the amount of education boys of twelve years of age at our schools possess, I don't think a boy would be educated in the way I should wish to send him out in the world. I believe in England it is otherwise, but my associations are with a different state of things.

26008. Supposing the children have to earn their living by their industry, do you not think that it is about the time of life when they must begin to learn a trade?—I should suppose so, under certain restrictions and modifications, not neglecting intellectual instruction.

26009. Admitting fully the fitness of the distinction that boarding schools for boys of twelve are a much less evil than boarding schools for boys of four years of age, does not your system of admitting boys only after they have attained the age of twelve put your schools practically out of the reach of poor children?—No; for the reason assigned in some of the answers I gave previously, that our system is not confined in its influence merely to our own schools, it extends a wholesome influence over all the other schools from which the candidates come to us, whereby education is stimulated, and masters and mistresses are encouraged to aim at a standard of teaching which they would not do if such an influence were not held out to them.

26010. Is it your opinion that instruction in French, classics, and science, is suitable for poor children?—I should say it is, if the pupils are intended to occupy places throughout the country which demand corresponding requirements.

26011. Is it not a degree of education which has a tendency to draw them out of their own class of life?—That is not always undesirable.

[Adjourned.]

# SIXTY-EIGHTH DAY.—DUBLIN, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1869.

## PRESIDENT.

The Right Hon. The Earl of PEARCE, Chairman.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNRAVEN, K. P.

The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACK.

Sir ROBERT KANE, P. R. S.

WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., M. P.

Rev. DAVID WILSON, D. D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORRIS COWIE, B. A.

JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q. C.

SCOTT NASHVILLE STOKES, Esq.

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M. P.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q. C. } Secretaries.  
D. B. DUNN, Esq. }

JOHN RYLAND, Esq., M. A., sworn and examined.

26012. The Chairman.—What is the office you now hold under the National Board of Education?—That of one of the professors in the training department in Marlborough-street.

26013. How long have you held that office?—I was appointed in December last, but my appointment dates from the 12th of July last. I succeeded Dr. Sullivan, and my appointment dates from the day after his death.

26014. Had you previously been in the service of the National Board?—I had, for nearly thirty-five years.

26015. What offices have you held?—That of assistant-professor. I have been all my time in the training department exclusively.

26016. Were you entirely Dr. Sullivan's assistant, or did you assist in any classes taught by the other professors?—I was almost all the time Dr. Sullivan's assistant; but at one time when I was the sole assistant, I did assist Mr. McGauley occasionally in arithmetic, geometry, and algebra.

26017. Now that you are principal professor, what are the subjects on which you lecture?—Those embraced in the literary department. I have the whole of that exclusively at present. Of course, I cannot take up the whole department, but I do what I can. I think in the last course I attempted too much; and, for the present class of teachers, I have selected those subjects that I think most useful and practical.

26018. Have you any assistants under you?—No.

7 H 2

Feb 20, 1869

John  
Gibson  
Stokes

Feb 20, 1869

John Ryland,  
Esq., M. A.

Feb. 20, 1902.

John Birtoul,  
Esq., &c.

26019. What are the subjects on which you are engaged with the set of teachers now in training?—I have examined them all since they came up on the 15th of January, in reading and grammar. I have done little more than that; it has taken up nearly my entire time, but it is not a mere examination—I have been instructing at the same time. While the others were listening, I have had two or three under examination, primarily to ascertain their qualifications in these branches, and then, when errors have been committed, I have explained the subject to those under examination and to the class generally. I have now just commenced geography.

26020. When will the class on which you are now engaged leave the institution?—On the 13th June.

26021. What other subjects do you expect to get through with them during that time?—I expect to do something in physical geography, and to go over a more extended course of grammar and composition, in addition to the practice of teaching. I should have mentioned that I have been giving instruction once a week since they came up on the principles of pronunciation and reading, which I think very important, as our teachers are deficient in those matters. I mean certain principles by which they may be enabled to correct the bad reading of their pupils, as as to elicit the sense of the passage.

26022. What are the modes in which you instruct the teachers in what you style "the practice of teaching"?—I commence with the First Book, with the teaching of the alphabet, and show the different modes prepared for the teaching of the alphabet. I then explain to them the principle on which the First Book is constructed in that respect. Then I go over a number of the lessons myself, and show them gradually, from one section to another, how the different lessons ought to be taught. Then, I sometimes call up shares of boys from the model school—six or eight boys at a time—and make the teachers go through the lessons with them. I instruct them myself in presence of the class, showing the kind of questions that ought to be put, and also make the teachers teach the boys before me. At other times I call up one of the teachers, and say—"Suppose now we had a class standing on the platform here, say what questions you would put as this paragraph." Then, after that has been done, I ask the class—"Have you any remark to make as the questions that have been put, or can you note any important omission that has been made?" Then I sum up these remarks myself, and show what was deficient, or what was good, in the style of teaching.

26023. Do you find the teachers criticize one another's performance freely?—To a small extent—at one time they did to a greater extent than at present—but they were sometimes so impulsive that I had to restrain them. I had seen that practised in Edinburgh and Glasgow long ago; but I found, owing perhaps to the Irish temperament, being too warm, that sometimes I had to restrain them from going into personalities, still it is practised to a small extent, but, of course, I stop at the moment there is the slightest intimation of anything personal.

26024. What amount of actual practice in the teaching of a class will each of the teachers get during the six months?—At present the class is divided—I am speaking now of the male teachers, but the same remarks apply, with some slight modifications, to the female also—the class is divided into two parts, one of which in the model school is teaching and observing how lessons is carried on there from half past ten till half past twelve, the other being engaged with the professors at lecture; they change at one o'clock, so that the division which was at lecture in the morning, attends the model school in the afternoon, and vice versa. This arrangement continues for a fortnight, after which the two divisions change places, that which was in the model schools in the morning now going up to lecture, and that which was at lecture, going to the model schools.

26025. Are those who are in the model schools

engaged in teaching?—Partly in teaching, partly in observing how the schools are conducted.

26026. Who is carrying on the model school while these pupil-teachers are thus engaged?—The head master of the model schools. I ought to mention that there are five male schools—the large school, No. 1, and four smaller ones, and the principal teacher of each is looking after them. In the small schools there are not more than two or three of the teachers in training or students at one time. There are twelve sections, of which eight are in the large school, I speak of the students when I use the word section. They are divided into twelve sections, eight of which are in the large school, and one in each of the other four. These twelve sections comprise half the class; there are, therefore, about three or four teachers in each section.

26027. Do these teachers go for a fortnight into the same section?—Not exactly; they are in the schools for a fortnight but then they are not in the same section, they are moved every two or three days from one section to another. In addition to that, I may say it has been usual—at least it was so when I was assistant professor—to note the teaching for four hours in the week, two hours in the female school and two hours in the male school.

26028. What do you mean by "noting the teaching"?—Taking notes of the mode of teaching of the students in training, when they are put over drafts or classes, for instance, of eight to twelve pupils, the student in teaching these twelve pupils for half an hour before a change is made. I go about from one draft to another noting the manner of teaching and anything particularly worth regard to it. These notes form the substance of a kind of familiar lecture in the class-room afterwards.

26029. How can you do that if you are engaged with the other half of the teachers in lecturing upstairs?—I ought to be able to do it if I had more assistance; but I have not been able to do it with the present class, owing to the amount of business I have had to do.

26030. Then, as regards the present class, is that mode of teaching in abeyance?—In so far as the literary department is concerned it is partly so, but Mr. O'Sullivan does it in the scientific department.

26031. Do you attach much importance to that note taking?—Yes, a good deal; for instance, I found a teacher yesterday paying too much attention to spelling, and putting some grammatical questions which were out of place, the mode of standing also is of importance. They sometimes stand very awkwardly, the book in the wrong hand, the head of the class at the wrong side, many things of that kind have been noted; also, standing so as to command a view of the entire class, so that none of the pupils may remain behind backs.

26032. Is it intended that you should have an assistant?—I do not know; I have no knowledge of what the Commissioners intend in the matter. Certainly the literary department is very much crippled at present, and has been so for more than a year past.

26033. You are not aware whether it is intended that the portion of the duties which were carried on by an assistant simultaneously with the other duties by the head professor, should or should not be continued?—I cannot tell; I have got no intimation on the subject; the Commissioners know how matters stand and I do not think it is my business to press the matter in any way. I have not been asked my opinion on the subject.

26034. Have you made any representation to the Commissioners as to the impossibility of carrying on two different duties at the same time, and sought information as to which of the duties they considered should give way to the other?—Not formally; I have not written on the subject, but at the last examination, in December, I stated to those Commissioners who were present what I had been doing during the last session, that is, from August to December, and that it was impossible the department could be so efficient as it had been previously, I may say down to January, 1898, because Dr. Sullivan took ill so

December, 1867, and was not able to do much during the spring course of 1868.

26035. Is not the practice of teaching and the practical instruction in teaching a part of the course in Marlborough-street which requires if possible to be increased rather than diminished?—I think so.

26036. Do you find much difference in the literary attainments of the teachers that form your present staff?—Yes; there is a very considerable difference in their attainments.

26037. Are there any who are deficient in reading and spelling?—I cannot speak as to spelling, as the females only have written an exercise for me yet. In reading there are some of them very deficient in bringing out properly the meaning of a sentence, and they have got a habit frequently of running words together that ought to be kept separate, so that it is very difficult to understand the meaning without looking at the book. I encourage the teachers always to shut the book in listening to reading, because you can never judge of a person's reading if you are looking at the book, the eye can take in what the ear cannot, so that what escapes the ear is supplied by the eye, and you can always judge of reading better by closing the book altogether and depending on the ear.

26038. When you begin with a new class do you inquire from them in what class of books they were studying when they last left school?—We inquire what class they are in, and how long they have been teaching, whether they have been principals, assistants, pupil teachers in model schools, or paid teachers.

26039. Can you say what proportion there are in your class who have not been in the Fourth or Fifth Books?—I cannot. I know in great many of the schools there are no fourth or fifth classes at all, third class is the highest in many of the schools.

26040. Do you suppose that one-half of those you are now instructing have not risen above the third class?—I could not say so, because though they may not be teaching those books they study them, and in fact use of the written exercises which I prescribe to them comprises questions in all the books up to the Fifth inclusive.

26041. Have you any control or supervision over the moral behaviour of those teachers out of lessons hours?—That is part of my duty now, to inspect the domestic establishments. I entered on that duty in January, last month.

26042. Would you state what your usual course under that head is during the week?—We receive reports from the heads of the different establishments every week. There is a regular form of report, and anything remarkable or deserving of being noted is mentioned in that report. Since I came into office, which, as I have stated, was only last month, there has been nothing special to remark in these weekly reports. I have personally inspected all the houses since I came into office along with Mr. Butler, my colleague.

26043. What are the subjects taught by the other professors?—The scientific department. His assistant, Mr. O'Sullivan, has the arithmetic and algebra; Mr. Tiffin teaches geometry and trigonometry chiefly, and he also gives some instruction in mechanics, optics, and (I believe) in heat.

26044. Are the arrangements by which the teachers divide their time between him and you made by you and him in concert or according to a time-table laid down by the Board?—We made out the time-table ourselves. I may state that the present arrangement of the time took place in August last, consequent on the death of Dr. Sullivan. As we had then only three lectures instead of four, which we have had for many years, we were obliged to make out a new time-table in the place, and do the best we could, consequently two-thirds of the time are given to the scientific department and one-third to the literary.

26045. Have you any communication—any at the end of three months—to see what progress the teachers have made, and which should be advanced to higher subjects and which kept to lower subjects?—We have examinations every week. In fact the examinations

are continuous with the teaching from time to time. For instance, every teacher is examined by me probably four or five times, and several of them often, during the course while the others are listening.

26046. Do those teachers continue in one large class the whole time of their teaching, or are they broken up into smaller classes according to their proficiency and progress?—They are in two great classes—senior and junior divisions of the class, both male and female all the time.

26047. Are teachers advanced from the junior to the senior, and the reverse according to the progress they make?—No.

26048. What is the distinction between senior and junior?—All those who are first of third class before they come up are put into the senior division. Sometimes we try to equalise the two divisions for convenience, and then it sometimes happens that some who are first of third will be in the junior division, and sometimes also others not so far advanced but who appear to be smart, especially pupil teachers of model schools, are put in the senior division.

26049. Do you refer to the previous proficiency shown by an examination of these teachers?—Yes; before they come up to be trained they are examined.

26050. What is the number of your present class?—Seventy-nine males and seventy-nine females in the general class.

26051. Can you state the classifications of these?—I have not a table of them, but I have each individual classification. I could do it, only it would take some time to go over.

26052. How many of the males, and how many of the females, are above first of third?—I can assure there are not more than three. I know that in the general class there are occasionally some second of second, probably not more than 4 per cent. of those that come up.

26053. About what proportion are below first of third when they come up?—I think generally speaking about one-half. I must make one exception, those who are pupil-teachers in model schools, who have been two years or so before they come up to be trained, are not usually classed when they come up. They come up to be classed, they are equal at least to first of third generally speaking, and so we include them as if they were first of third. Including them I should say one-half of those that come up to be trained are first of third.

26054. Do you think it would be an improvement in the training in model schools, if the whole of the schools were under one master?—Do you include the training as well as the model schools?

26055. Yes?—I think strictly one master or one head should be the case, but in the circumstances of Ireland, I think there should be two at least, simply on religious grounds.

26056. Do you think the advantages of unity of discipline must be sacrificed to the difficulties of religion?—I think we must take into account the public feeling to a certain extent. My answer leans on that. I think for instance, if a Roman Catholic were the head, the Protestant community would not be satisfied, or vice versa.

26057. When the masters of the boarding establishments, or any other persons, report the teachers in training to you for misconduct, what power of punishment do you possess?—When any complaint is made (which occurs very seldom I am glad to say, but it has occurred) we investigate it, consider all the circumstances, and recommend to the Board what punishment should be inflicted. There are printed rules of the Commissioners lying up in the establishments, in which the penalty for a fault is stated, and it takes effect, or there may be some circumstances which would induce us to recommend a modification of that punishment to the Board.

26058. Have you any discretion in inflicting reproof or punishment, or are you obliged to refer everything to the Board?—No, not everything. Anything very grave, involving perhaps dismissal, of course would

Feb. 20, 1868.

John Russell.  
Esq., M.P.

Feb 20, 1868.

John Russell,  
Esq., M.P.

be referred to the Board; but any slight matter in which a teacher might be fined, suppose a shilling, for some fault or other, would not be referred to the Board. There was a case under investigation very recently, in which there was a complaint against one of the inscription class for refusing to work the pump, and for which he was fined a shilling; such a thing as that would not be referred to the Board.

26059. Do you think it would be possible to extend the period of training to two years, extending over twelve months?—I do not think that would be practicable as regards teachers of schools. I think it would be very desirable in regard to the pupil-teachers and others of that class. It was attempted on one occasion to extend the course to eight or nine months, but we were compelled to abandon the plan, as on account of the teachers being so long away the schools deteriorated in their absence, and several had in consequence to leave the training and return home.

26060. Do you think that with regard to teachers who are actually nominated to schools, six months is the longest time they can practically be allowed to remain away?—I think so.

26061. With regard to those not actually teachers holding schools, do you think the advantage gained by the additional training would compensate to the system for training a smaller number of individuals in each year?—We have a special class at present who remain twelve months with us. I have thought over this subject, and it has struck me that what we now call the special class might be abolished, and a larger class of a similar character introduced, who could remain twelve months without going through the general class; and then the general class might consist of teachers in actual possession of schools who would remain five months, so that one class might be discontinued and the other increased. The special class has been trained already—that is the individuals in the special class have gone through the general class, and, having been selected for their qualifications as likely to turn out good teachers, they are summoned to the special class, which consists of twenty-four males and fifteen females, and in which they remain for a year, so that they really get a year and a half's training if they remain the entire time.

26062. Are there any points in which your long experience as a Professor in Marlborough street leads you to devise any modification of the present arrangements with regard to teaching and training?—I have always felt there is too little time for instruction in the practice of teaching. Suppose I take a lesson from the Third Book, for instance, which is a very good book for testing a teacher's qualifications, being neither too high nor too low, I find few of them can distinguish the sentences properly, and evolve by appropriate questions the matter contained in a sentence; they do not look sufficiently before them and sense the principal points in the sentence which should be first made clear. They are deficient also in supplying collateral information on other matters alluded to, besides points of grammar, the construction of the sentence, and so on.

26063. Is your principal time devoted to didactical instruction at examining teachers on the subject-matter of the lectures they hear?—The lectures, generally speaking, are not formal lectures. In showing how the books are taught, I talk to the teachers in a familiar way, and will stop, perhaps, at the end of five minutes and say—"Now, have you any question to put to me, or is there anything I have not made quite clear?" Then, perhaps, some teacher will say—"I do not quite understand what you meant by such a thing." I then explain that to them, and every explanation given has, as much as possible, a bearing on practical teaching. In regard to grammar again, I call up, perhaps, six or seven on the platform, and examine them on a subject which has been previously given out, the others all listening. Then I comment. Perhaps I find some obscurity in their knowledge, which I endeavour to explain and remove. That is

the kind of lecture I give—comments, explanations, and illustrations, on the subject-matter before us. Perhaps I might talk from twenty minutes to half an hour on a subject that requires elucidation.

26064. What amount of time either stated by the week, or during the course of six months, would you like to see devoted in each class to the practice of teaching?—I think there should be at least an hour a week devoted to instruction in the practice of teaching—one hour in the week in each class.

26065. Practically, how much do they get under the present system?—There is no doubt we are defective in that regard. Sometimes I find it necessary, in some classes, as in our division of the classes, to spend more time on grammar, or on composition, or something of that kind than at another time—just as I find time for it. Last course I spent more time than usual upon instruction in teaching; the consequence was that I had to content some of the other branches.

26066. Are the teachers that come up to you now better grounded in grammar, generally, than they were ten years ago?—Better now, far better than the district model schools were introduced. They are certainly very much in advance now, but when I contrast them with what they were thirty years ago there is a wonderful improvement in general knowledge altogether.

26067. Is grammar more attended to in the district model schools than in the ordinary schools?—I do not say so, but there are smart young men that come from the model schools, and they are generally very well up in those points. This, however, is not uniformly the case, for some are deficient. For instance, I have just gone through an examination of the present class that came up on the 16th of last month. I have here the result of my examination, and I find one of the very first who was a pupil-teacher in Waterford model school stands very high in grammar; the next one to him is a pupil-teacher in New towns model school, and I find he has reached little more than one-half the proficiency of the other. I find again on the other side, a teacher from Cork who is very high up in grammar, and I find another from Longford who is pretty well up, though not quite so high, and others again are rather low. I find one turning over the leaf, a teacher from the county Tyrone rather low in grammar, and another from Galway lower still, very low in grammar—knows very little about it.

26068. Mr. O'Brien.—What was the date of Professor Sullivan's first illness?—It was the day before Christmas in 1867; the 24th of December, 1867.

26069. For what period was he incapacitated from attending to the duties of his office?—He was not able to do anything since that date, except for a short time. He examined each of the teachers—continuing, I knew, to the advice of his medical attendant and to that of me all—in reading, and made them parse sentences. That was all that the doctor was able to do.

26070. During the period of his inability to discharge efficiently the duties of the office, what arrangement was made to carry on his duties?—There was an arrangement made in the spring course of last year, because Dr. Sullivan occupied his hours partly—

26071. When he was not able to attend to his duties, what arrangement was made?—I took part of his duties, Mr. Butler sometimes took part also. I desisted from being down in the model schools during that time, and took Dr. Sullivan's hour when he was not able to be present, and Mr. Butler sometimes took it also.

26072. What was the date of his death?—The 11th of July, 1868.

26073. Up to that time you were merely assistant professor to Dr. Sullivan?—Quite so; that is, since Dr. Sullivan's appointment. Before that I was not his assistant.

26074. Rev. Dr. Ffrench.—But you were assistant professor?—I was, before Dr. Sullivan's appointment, under Dr. McArthur.

26075. Mr. O'Brien.—Was there any period during which a successor to Dr. Sullivan was not appointed?



Feb. 26, 1899.  
—  
John Rutledge,  
esq., R.A.

what was the interval between the death of Dr. Sullivan and your appointment to his office?—My appointment was made on the 15th of December, although it dates back from the day after Dr. Sullivan's death.

26076 And there has been no person, I think, appointed assistant in your place since that time?—No.

26077 Then, in point of fact, you have been discharging since Dr. Sullivan's death the duties which he discharged, and the duties which you, as his successor were in the habit of discharging?—As far as I am able to do so.

26078 Do you consider it necessary to the efficient discharge of the duties which Dr. Sullivan had that there should be an assistant appointed to you as he had formerly when you were his assistant?—I do, certainly.

26079 Rev. Dr. Wilson. — Will you describe the special class, and say what it is?—The special class consists of males and females who have passed through the general class, and have been selected by the professors and assistants for further training. All who select are not summoned, but it is considered a mark of honour to be selected, and teachers are gratified when they know that they are selected. Then, as vacancies occur, those teachers are summoned. They may decline. Many of them do, and particularly of late, as it is now so difficult to get schools in point of fact, we recommend them not to come up if they already have schools; many of them have been pupil-teachers in model schools.

26080 On what ground is the selection made?—On the ground of superior qualifications, and the likelihood of their turning out good teachers.

26081 So that they are chosen for this special class because they are or are supposed to be of a superior class of qualifications?—Yes.

26082 And young men?—They are chiefly young persons. We never take married men into the special class.

26083 What is the number annually in the special class?—There are twenty-four males and fifteen females, but they do not all remain the whole year; they go out to schools, when there is an opportunity. When we are applied to by managers of schools in the country, we recommend these young men and women to take charge of those schools, if we had they are competent after remaining for a time with us.

26084 And are there frequent applications made to you for such teachers?—Comparatively few now; there were formerly many more.

26085 Then you give to the parties applying to you the option of having such teachers on account of their superior merit as you suppose?—Quite so.

26086 You have stated that you put the first of that who came up for training into the senior class?—Yes.

26087 Do you do so as a matter of course?—As a matter of course. We take for granted the classification of the inspectors.

26088 You do not interfere with the classification of the inspectors?—We do not interfere.

26089 I understand the Commissioners are aware of that practice?—Of the division?

26090 Yes?—They may not be aware of the principle, I presume they are.

26091 Then do you not as professors examine the teachers when they come up?—Certainly.

26092 And you do not—I gather from what you have stated—appoint them to senior or junior class because of their attainments, do you?—We take the classification as it is; if they are first of third they are in the senior division.

26093 As a matter of course?—As a matter of course.

26094 But if you found any of these in your opinion as professors, to be of inferior qualification would you put them into the junior class?—No; we do not, because by that time the arrangements have been made; but then it does not follow, that at the end of the session the senior class is very superior,

or more highly trained. There are individuals, for instance, in the junior division who at the end of the course occasionally attain to higher classes than those in the senior.

26095 Is there any practical difference so far as the business of the class, and the mode of conducting it are concerned, between the senior and the junior class?—There is not, only that in some branches, the senior division goes a little ahead of the other, and they can get more quickly over the ground being better qualified.

26096 Can you say how many persons have passed through the training establishment since your connection with it?—We have trained 5,373 males, and 2,690 females, that is in the general class, exclusive of the special class.

26097 Can you say how many in the special class?—Over 300 females in the special class, and about 650 males, perhaps two or three over that number.

26098 From what period to what period?—I refer to all whom you have commemorated as trained?—In the general class from February, 1834. The first class commenced in February, 1834.

26099 To the end of?—Including those to the end of December last, 1898.

26100 Do you think that generally the vast majority of those who come up for training are really desirous to become teachers?—I know nothing to the contrary. I think so.

26101 Is it your opinion that previous to taking charge of a school, teachers should be trained?—I question that. I think that when they have had charge of a school for a short time, they see their deficiencies better. They can appreciate different modes of communicating instruction, I think, better than those who have never had charge of schools.

26102 Do you regard it as of importance then, that all parties who come up to you for training should have a preparatory course of training?—It would be desirable I think. When I say charge of a school, I do not mean as principal. It may be as assistant, or as pupil teacher or monitor, engaged in fact in teaching.

26103 Now from your experience of the parties who have come up at different ages, of what age do you say that the training should begin as a rule?—Do you mean at the central training establishment here?

26104 Yes?—I think they are too young, if they are under eighteen or nineteen. We have had several female teachers up, from sixteen to seventeen years of age, who were quite incapable of keeping up with the business of the class, their minds not being sufficiently formed.

26105 Generally speaking, and leaving out of consideration those of so low an age, do the young persons usually come well prepared to take advantage of your lectures and training generally?—There is really such a difference in their qualifications, that it is impossible to say absolutely yes or no.

26106 Quite so, you have already stated that there is not even uniformity in reference to model schools?—No.

26107 And I suppose the same holds of the young persons generally from the different parts of the country?—Yes, quite so.

26108 Can you say how many teachers for National schools are required annually, owing to the death of teachers or their abandoning their position as such?—I think it would be impossible to form an estimate of that in consequence of many of the teachers leaving the service; but if the teachers generally remained in the service, I should think from about 300 to 350 ought to be sufficient. Something over 300 I should think the annual waste from mortality and from old age.

26109 Have you or any of the professors altogether followed the young persons, who have left your establishment trained to teach, so that you can say whether many of them go on to teaching as a profession, or whether they abandon it?—No; we have no means of following them, but during the course of years we hear from time to time when they are succeeding well, and we see them sometimes; they call upon us in Dublin. A teacher from Liverpool

Vol. 20, 1869.  
John Bristol,  
esq., M.A.

called here within the last three weeks, who was trained upwards of thirty years ago, a very distinguished man as a teacher—trained from county Sligo.

26110 Can you say whether many come up for training whose intention it is not to become teachers, but to prepare for something more to their taste?—I think not, I think there are very few; at least the ostensible reason of their coming is certainly to prepare to be teachers.

26111 Rev. Mr. Conic—You say that the number of persons trained has been reckoned by thousands?—Yes.

26112 How many teachers are there in National schools in Ireland now?—About 8,600, including assistants.

26113 Of the 8,600 teachers now in employment, how many do you suppose have passed your training establishment speaking roughly?—I suppose about three or four thousand.

26114 Not quite half?—No, I should think not.

26115 Then what has become of all these whom you have trained?—I am not sure, a great many have emigrated to other countries, and a good many have gone to other employments, where they have been better remunerated.

26116 But the money that has been spent by the State on educating these persons as teachers, has probably been lost to the State?—Not exactly I think, because if they remain in the country, the State has the benefit of the money that has been expended.

26117 Not at all?—Although not as teachers.

26118 But is not the preparation in Marlborough-street specially adapted for producing teachers?—Quite so, because the lectures and the course of instruction, are not of so much use for general knowledge. The instruction is rather technical. It is all bearing upon teaching.

26119 Your object, I suppose, is to furnish these men and women in training with the best methods, to show them how to teach children rapidly and soundly, and to give them the subjects which they ought to teach soundly themselves?—Quite so.

26120 Now, if a large proportion of these persons, who are trained at some expense to the State, in Marlborough-street, afterwards do not become teachers in the National schools, is not that in some respects, at any rate, a failure of your system?—I do not know that altogether. They have acquired habits of discipline in connection with it.

26121 But if they leave the office of teacher you do not get back that power expended usefully for the children?—No; you do not.

26122 Although they may be very valuable members of society, more valuable than they would be before, yet their value has not been secured to the National schools of Ireland?—Quite so; that arises, I presume, from the teachers getting better remuneration elsewhere, in other departments.

26123 I do not refer to it as a deficiency of the training establishment, it more properly belongs to the miserable remuneration which is given to the teachers?—Quite so.

26124 I want to know whether there is any head whatever of your training department?—The two professors are the heads.

26125 But are they the heads of the department?—I think to a great extent they are.

26126 Who arranges the duties of each professor?—Themselves.

26127 Each of the four?—Well, there have been two professors and two assistant professors. For instance, when I was assistant to Dr. Sullivan he said to me, "Here are our subjects, now do you take so and so, and I shall take so and so." But that did not always continue, for he would say, "I would like you for this course to take up these subjects; I shall take something else."

26128 As the senior professor he was responsible for the literary department, I suppose?—Quite so.

26129 Did he ever overlook the work that you did with your classes?—No.

26130 Then, so far he had abandoned his responsibility with regard to what he had entrusted to you?—No, not altogether, because he would sometimes say, "Now, what do you think of such and such a man in such a subject?" And then I would say, "I think so and so," and then he would say, "Well, I put a few questions to him the other day and I think that he knows more about it than you seem to think, and must examine him again," and then he would say, "I am perfectly sure about 3%," and so on; and he would overlook my work to that extent.

26131 But from my acquaintance with training establishments in England I cannot conceive the existence of a training school without a single responsible head, because I do not see how the duty is to be assigned to each officer and how he is to be guided in that duty, and occasionally stock-takers of what he has done, unless there is some one person who is responsible for that; and that is not the case you say in the establishment in Marlborough-street—there is not one head?—That is in reference to the teaching, to the actual teaching; but, in reference to the domestic establishments, the two professors are alone responsible. I never had anything to do with these domestic establishments until now. So long as I was assistant I had no right to go into them, even to see what they were doing after hours. The two professors are responsible for those.

26132 There are a large number of pupil teachers, are there not, and monitors, in the model schools?—Yes.

26133 Who is responsible for their progress and good conduct?—The head master of each model school.

26134 But are not the professors in fact in the position of managers towards the master?—They are.

26135 Do they ever examine the pupil teachers and monitors of the model school?—At one period, I was requested to do so by the professors, and I examined the whole of the pupil teachers and put monitors in both the male and female and infant schools, and reported the result to the professors, when I was assistant.

26136 Has that been done more than once?—I do not think it has, and the reason is that we have not confidence in the heads of the schools. We see the lads at work, and if there is anything wrong the head master immediately reports. For instance, there was one reported within the last three weeks—a monitor who was disobedient, or not doing his work properly.

26137 When was he reported to?—To the professors.

26138 To the two professors?—To the two professors.

26139 That is to you and to Mr. Bates?—Yes.

26140 What action did you take upon that report?—The boy promised to do better in future.

26141 But did you summon him before both of you?—Yes, Mr. Joyce, the head master of the model schools, brought him before both of us, and made a complaint of this boy not attending to his duties properly, and I rather think the question is not settled yet; he was to be removed.

26142 I only want to know the function that you have in such matters as professors of the training department?—We directed that he should be removed to another of the schools from the one in which he was, and get a month's trial; and then he was to be recommended to the Board for dismissal, if he did not improve.

26143 Is there any time-table drawn up for the students in training?—There is.

26144 Who draws it up?—We all draw it up in concert, that is to say, the professors call in the aid of their assistants; that is the way in which it has been done, and then it is submitted to the Board. I have a copy here of one of the time-tables—that is during Dr. Sullivan's time. That continued up to August last.

26145 If anything prevents you from attending to

you class, absent, or anything of that kind, to whom do you send a notification of that hindrance?—Hitherto I have sent it to the professors; I have addressed it to the professors.

26146. But you are a professor yourself?—It has never occurred since I became professor.

26147. But suppose it did occur, what would you do?—I would send a note to Mr. Butler.

26148. But what would that matter to him, because your charge is the literary department?—Well, but then my class would be sent by him to the model school, and be employed in some way under the head master during my absence.

26149. The Chairman.—Have you any authority over the head master?—I think not. We are superintendents of the model schools, and if I saw anything contrary to the Commissioners' rules, I would speak to the head master or report anything decidedly wrong, but practically that does not occur.

26150. Rev Mr. Gaskell.—Whom would you report it to?—To the Commissioners, through the secretaries.

26151. The Chairman.—What is the relative position of the professors to the head master? Do you consider that the professors are higher in rank or on an equality?—Oh, higher in rank decidedly, because they superintend the model schools, and the weekly reports from the different schools are sent to the professors. They make out a summary, and countersign every report. One of the professors signs every weekly report coming from the different model schools before sending it in to the Board at their weekly meeting.

26152. Mr. Sullivan.—Who inspects the central model school?—It is not formally inspected. It was done once by Mr. McGahey.

26153. Is not it part of the duty of the professors to inspect the model schools?—It is, I presume, but we are in those model schools every day. We see everything going on. It is not like a school at a distance, if there is anything decidedly wrong we observe it.

26154. Has it been inspected within the last ten years?—The only formal inspection that I recollect was by Mr. McGahey. That must be more than twelve years ago. It took him several weeks to do so, and his ordinary business had to be partially suspended.

26155. Then in fact the Commissioners and the public know less of the central model school than they do of any other school in the country?—I think not, besides we are in the model schools, as I have said, every day, and we see everything going on. The timetable is there, and everything goes on like clockwork.

26156. Do you check the accounts?—They are all checked—the weekly accounts.

26157. By whom?—By one of the professors.

26158. Have you ever checked them?—I have every week since I came into office last month.

26159. Have you visited any of the boarding houses of the training department?—Yes, I have inspected them all. I went on duty, as I visited a little while ago, on the first of January, last month, and I have inspected them all, and have received the weekly reports from the different domestic establishments, and have countersigned them.

26160. Who lectures upon logic?—Dr. Sullivan at one time used to give instruction in logic. I have done so for the last eight or nine years. We do not give it that formal name. We take up Archbishop Whately's "Lessons on Reasoning," and go to a certain extent over that, as far as the time will permit.

26161. Does it enter into the classification of the teachers?—It does, certainly, to some extent; it is taken into account.

26162. In this present session have any lectures been given on logic?—Not one; we have not had time yet to take up the subject; the teachers have been little more than a month up. They came on the 15th of January, and the first two or three days were occupied in registering, examining certificates, and so on.

26163. Who returns on the classification of lan-

guages? I find a question here in the examination for 1867.—Specify the several great nations that speak the Latin and Greek languages, the Teutonic, the Slavonic, the Monosyllabic, and the Sclavonic?—This is not connected with the training department.

26164. This is the district examination for 1867. Are the teachers expected to know that?—I do not know anything about the District Inspectors. I have nothing to do with their duties.

26165. Quite obviously the teachers are supposed to have acquired that knowledge when they are trained, if that is put as a question to them?—I am not aware of any instruction on that subject.

26166. Do you think that this is a question that really ought to be included in the programme for a National school teacher?—I think not, I think that there are very few who would answer it.

26167. Is it your opinion that the five months' training that the teachers receive at Marlborough-street is of any value whatever?—I think it is of great value.

26168. Mr. Gaskell.—Can you take it upon you to say that the material of the answers to that question may not be found in the books which are handed to them for their own private study?—It may, I have not seen the Fifth Book, it is only published. The substance of it may be in some of the new books.

26169. But in the large geography, which is put in the hands of teachers (I was not aware of it myself)?—I am not aware of it. If that question is put by the Inspectors I would assume that the answer may be found, as should be found in some of the books published.

26170. Mr. Stobson.—Have you had under your care any young persons brought up as monitors of the ordinary schools?—Yes.

26171. Have you observed any great difference between them and monitors from model schools in point of attainments?—I think that those from model schools are superior; that is, the pupil-teachers of model schools.

26172. Is that difference in favour of the pupil-teachers of model schools very marked?—I think so; I think decidedly so.

26173. Do you think that if the monitors were retained at the best of the ordinary schools for a somewhat longer period they could not reach the point now attained by the pupil-teachers in the model schools?—I think not. There is greater teaching power in the model schools. The teachers of those schools have better opportunities of improvement.

26174. I ask you, from your experience, if you please—have you found it so experimentally?—I naturally expect more from a pupil-teacher in a model school, on examination.

26175. Do you find that they take a higher class than the other persons in training?—I think so—decidedly.

26176. Have you any opportunities of watching them afterwards—do you think that in their schools they make practically better teachers?—I do not know, I have no opportunities.

26177. At present the Board has three grades of persons in training, has it not?—Monitors, pupil-teachers, and assistant and parental teachers.

26178. What are the young persons in your class?—They are principal teachers of schools, assistant teachers, pupil-teachers, paid monitors, and even sometimes pupils.

26179. But the course of training provided by the National Board comprises three grades—a young person may begin as a monitor, go on then to be pupil teacher, and ultimately come up to Dialect to complete his training—is that the full course?—Not precisely, they sometimes come up as paid monitors, and also as pupil-teachers, before they have ever been principals or assistants.

26180. Do you see any great advantage which the country derives from maintaining that separate class, the pupil teachers?—I think they are very useful in schools. The name matters little whether you call them pupil-teachers or senior monitors.

26181. But inasmuch as the pupil-teachers are

Feb. 20, 1880

John Bessell,  
CRO., M.A.

confined to twenty-six favourite schools placed by the Commissioners at an enormous cost to the country in twenty-six favoured spots, half of them being in Ulster, do you think it is fair to the ordinary schools to offer to those pupil-teachers greater advantages than other monitors in other parts of the island can obtain?—I do not know, when the Commissioners have established model schools they naturally wish them to be as efficient as possible and to be models for the country around.

26182. But if you can provide a class of trained teachers suited to the work which they will have to discharge, from the ordinary schools and from the ordinary class of monitors, proking the course perhaps for a year or more, would not that be a more equitable as well as a cheaper mode of supplying trained teachers than maintaining the present small but expensive class of pupil-teachers?—I assume that your question would imply that they would be better paid also if they had an extended course in ordinary school—that they would be paid equally perhaps to what they receive at present in model schools.

26183. What does a senior monitor receive now do you know?—In our establishment here?

26184. No, in an ordinary school; are your monitors paid on a different scale from the monitors in ordinary schools?—They are paid higher than the pupils, and lower than the senior monitors. I know the monitors in the female school are paid from £3 up to £6 a year. The female pupil-teachers are paid from £10 up to £20, the monitors are paid from £4 to £8, and the male pupil-teachers up to £20, as MONITORS' ORDER.

26185. But is not that payment in addition to the £20 allowed to them as the cost of board and lodging?—No, they board and lodge with their parents or friends, and they get nothing beyond that. The females commence at £3 a year, and go up to £6.

26186. The monitors?—The monitors, in the kingdom who receive less than £20 a-year?—Yes, those are; at the Central Establishment here they receive £20 when they are at their maximum.

26188. Under the scale settled by the Board?—I think so; I think I am correct. I examine them. They obtain their places by competition, and I always take down what is their present pay.

26189. Is not an allowance of £20 a-year made to every pupil-teacher for board and lodging, and then, in the second year, for extra services they are supposed to give in the school, they receive something, varying from £8 to £12?—No; there is no pupil-teacher who receives more than £20 a-year.

26190. Then, is there one rule for the district model schools, and another for the central model schools, in Marlborough-street?—I think so.

26191. Do you know the reason why the young people in Dublin receive less than those in the country?—No, I do not, unless it be that they live with their parents here in the city, and that they come sometimes from a distance in the country to the district model school.

26192. Is not the difference between a monitor and a pupil-teacher in the rules of your Board, that the monitor lives at home, and the pupil-teacher, who is supposed to come from a distance, is boarded at the cost of the country?—You are speaking of the district model schools. I am not personally acquainted with these, and I have not anything to do with them officially. I know about our own here, that the monitor class is selected from the pupils by competition, and that as vacancies occur, the pupil-teachers are selected exclusively from the monitors, also by competition.

26193. Are they selected exclusively from the monitors in the central model schools?—They are. No one can be nominated for a pupil-teacher who is not a monitor.

26194. Might the monitors from the ordinary National schools here in Dublin, or in the neighbourhood, compete for pupil-teacherships in the

central model school?—They might; and they have done so on some occasions, but they are practically, I may say, restricted to the pupils of our own schools, though there is nothing to prevent those of other schools from competing with them. I remember once or two instances in which monitors, or assistants, were recommended by the District Inspector.

26195. Have you anything to do with the selection of teachers of model schools?—No, not the slightest.

26196. Who selects the teachers for model schools?—The Commissioners; but through their officers. I think it is the Chiefs of Inspection principally, or the Head Inspectors, but in our department we have nothing whatever to do with the district model schools.

26197. Are not the professors consulted in reference to the suitability of persons for employment as teachers of model schools?—Sometimes we have been, but very rarely. We have been asked "What do you think of such and such a person—whether they would be suitable for such a school?" and then we tell him or her qualifications from our notes when in training. But with the actual selection we have nothing to do.

26198. But have not several persons been appointed teachers of model schools direct from your special class?—Yes, as assistants.

26199. Have such appointments been made without the recommendation of the professor who has had to do with their training?—I think not. I think in such a case as that—but the cases are few—we have been consulted about the qualifications of the teacher.

26200. Do you see any advantage in maintaining the plan of letting young persons go out to teach schools before they finish their training with you?—Do you mean going out from the training school?

26201. No; but I understand the ordinary course to have been for young persons to become monitors or pupil-teachers, and then to go out and take schools of their own and become teachers of schools, and when they have been teachers for a time, to bring some of them to Marlborough-street to complete their training?—Yes.

26202. I ask, would it not be better to allow the young persons to finish their course completely before they go out to schools?—I think they should know something of the difficulties of teaching before they come to be trained, either as monitors, or as pupil-teachers, or as assistants, for a time at least. I think it is an advantage. They can appreciate the instruction better when they know the difficulties that they have to contend with, and they are prepared to ask questions as to how they should teach and conduct classes.

26203. Do not the monitors and pupil-teachers obtain that experience sufficiently while employed as monitors and pupil-teachers?—They do, certainly, to some extent.

26204. Then, as far as the class of monitors and pupil-teachers is concerned, would you see any difficulty in bringing them at once to Marlborough-street, completing their term as students, and sending them out to schools without further thought of training?—When they are very smart that may be done, at least as regards the pupil-teachers, because they have had experience in teaching classes, but they have not had the responsibility of a school.

26205. Where does the responsibility come in in the course exactly, in the assistant or trained teacher as an untrained teacher, is he an ex-monitor, an ex-pupil-teacher, or what is he?—Are you speaking of our training establishment here—the central one?

26206. No. I want the general definition of an assistant?—He is assistant in a National school where there is a principal teacher.

26207. Is he a classed teacher?—He may be classed by the District and Head Inspectors who examine and classify them as they do principal teachers—in the same way.

26208. What are the conditions which he must fulfil?—There must be a certain average attendance in the school before he can be appointed.

26209 But personally, for himself? He should be at least equal to several divisions of third class.

26210 How is that ascertained?—By personal inspection and examination.

26211 Then he is a classified person, is he?—He is classified by the Inspectors. But I am speaking of matters not of my own personal knowledge, but from my general knowledge of the whole system. These matters do not come under me at all personally or specially.

26212 Rev. Mr. Coote.—How many hours a day are you employed at Marlborough-street?—I am employed at present in actual teaching twelve and a-half hours a week, and I should have, had I had, before my present appointment, four hours' noting in the model schools, as I have already mentioned.

26213 That is watching the pupils in the model schools?—Taking notes of the teachers in training in the model schools. When I was assistant to Dr. Sullivan I had about ten hours actual teaching in the week besides these four hours noting, but that does not show all the work done; for besides that I have to meet about a thousand exercises in the year at home.

26214 About a thousand in the year?—In the year, sometimes twelve hundred I have had.

26215 How many young persons have you actually in training in the course of a year?—We have about two hundred in each class, for instance, as I have said, there are 154 at present in the general class male and female, and there are twenty-four and fifteen in the special class, and there are six exercises.

26216 That is altogether about 200 students in the class?—About 200 students in training; sometimes they write what I call three formal exercises in the course, for me, that would be 600 in the course; and that makes 1,500 in the year. I have had 1,200 to send over in a year frequently.

26217 Do you not think that when you are training these people they should be examined very frequently, if they were examined once a month and the same thing in exercises, would you consider that too much?—I could not possibly read all the exercises and attend to my other duties.

26218 Are you not aware that in most of the training schools in England all the pupils of the college are examined every week, on paper, with written exercises from every pupil every week?—Well, I know that it takes me on an average about ten or twelve minutes to read each exercise, and enter in my notebook the character of it. I generally first give a composition exercise. I correct these carefully with red ink—the spelling—and any grammatical errors, I take a note of the grammatical and general character of the exercise; I spend a couple of hours, or three, perhaps, in the class, reading over some of these; I select a few good ones, a few middling ones, and a few bad ones, and point out the errors, and how the sentences may be turned in various ways. Well, something of that kind, but by means of shorter exercises, should be done more frequently than at present if I had an assistant. When I was assistant to Dr. Sullivan I had to do that.

26219 Corrected by yourself, or by whom?—By myself.

26220 You are lecturer on geography?—That is part of my duty.

26221 Do you require the pupils to make maps?—No.

26222 How do they learn geography—from a book?—From a text-book, they get a certain portion to prepare, and then I examine on that, and comment, and illustrate the different subjects.

26223 Have you been many years employed in teaching geography?—For about twelve years since 1833.

26224 And does your experience lead you to the conclusion that people can learn geography from a text book?—I am speaking of physical geography.

26225 I do not speak of physical geography?—Oh, no, they must learn it from the maps of course. I remember, in the year 1835, when we first got maps—

I formed the men in shifts around the map and made them teach each other and point out on the map, the rivers, towns, and so on.

26226 That, for classes in the National schools, may do very well, but with your masters and pupil-teachers, and persons who want to become teachers of schools do you think that they will ever learn geography in fact unless they make plenty of maps themselves?—They cannot learn properly without maps.

26227 But making maps themselves, that is the distinction?—We have never done so.

26228 Mr. Stokes.—You have stated that you revise 1,200 exercises in twelve months; what use is made of the corrected exercise?—I keep a record of all my marks, and a summary of the character of the different exercises, and that goes towards the classification.

26229 Is it part of the examination, or is it part of the process of training for the young persons to write their papers for you?—It is part of the training.

26230 Then have the young persons an opportunity of putting by your corrections—does the corrected paper get back into the hands of the writer?—No, that was the practice at one time, but I found that it was disagreeable work. The teachers found fault with my corrections in some cases, and they, in fact, wished to justify their mistakes, and there was no time for it.

26231 So that corrections are made for your own benefit?—No, I have stated already that I read over those exercises to the class, and tell them the corrections I have made, and why I have made them. We spend several hours in this.

26232 Mr. Deane.—Do you read them all?—I read them all at home, but I make a selection of those that are read in the class.

26233 Mr. Sullivan.—What text book in geography do you use?—Sullivan's Geography Generalized.

26234 Do you not use the Epitome of Geography?—Very little. I have used it for the physical geography of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America—but comparatively little.

26235 Why is it not used?—In the first place there is no time for more than we actually do—hurry through as we may.

26236 Is there any other reason?—I have no other reason. Of course hitherto I have always acted under the authority of Dr. Sullivan, and he wished me to go through the lessons in his book.

26237 Do you believe that the Epitome of Geography which I have named, is up to the present condition of the subject?—I think not; I do not think it is a book that can very well be used in schools generally. There is a great deal of information in it so reading upon specific matters; but the way in which it is divided, is not calculated exactly for teaching—for a class book.

26238 Is all the information in it correct?—I do not know. I have not read it for some time. I think it was not, for I remember at one time reading it rather carefully, and correcting a number of errors in it.

26239 Sir Robert Kane.—Do you at any part of your training put one of your pupils to a blackboard, and tell him to draw a map of Ireland, and put in the cities and towns?—To a very small extent we do something of that kind. We have not time in fact for local geography—we have very little of that. We teach them mathematical and physical geography more particularly, but they do get examinations upon the principal rivers and towns of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in a general way towards the end of the course.

26240 But you do not take any pains of making them realise it?—Except from the maps which they have. They make use of their atlases and the maps on the walls. They have to teach of course in the model schools, from the different maps.

26241 Mr. Coates.—Mr. Stokes asked you about the year's pay of pupil-teachers. I forget exactly what the average was that you gave—it was in reference to the paid monitors at our central establishment; I think he asked you about £20 a year, what was your answer to that?—My answer was that the pupil-

Feb. 26, 1861—  
John Estlin,  
etc., &c.

Feb. 22, 1890. teacher has more than £20 a year (book handed to witness)

John Bantel,  
esq., M.A.

26242. Just look at that statement, and you will see something about it?—(Reads.)—"The masters are allowed in the first year, £6, the second year, £8, the third year, £10, the fourth year, £12. In the case of pupil-teachers resident in the house, an allowance at the rate of £20 a year is granted to the master for the board, &c., of each." But that applies not to the central establishment at all, but to the

district model schools with regard to the payment of which I do not know anything.

26243. Are there any pupil-teachers resident in Dublin?—There are; there are twelve in the model school.

26244. Resident in £3?—No; resident out of doors 26245. They do not reside and board?—No; they all reside with their parents. We have never had boarders here.

Edward  
Sheehy, esq.

EDWARD SHEEHY, Esq., sworn and examined.

26246. The Chairman.—You are now one of the Inspectors under the National Board?—Yes, I am first-class District Inspector.

26247. What is your district?—The North Dublin.

26248. Were you formerly connected with the training institution in Marlborough street?—Yes; for three years.

26249. What was the office you had?—I was assistant to the professors.

26250. In which department?—In the training department.

26251. Was that literary or scientific?—It was scientific, my lord.

26252. Who was your chief?—Mr. McGeale for a while; and for ten months I was principal lecturer upon mathematics and some of the physical sciences.

26253. What were the subjects on which you gave lectures while you were assistant professor?—On arithmetic, algebra, geometry, measurement, trigonometry, mechanics, pneumatics, and the steam engine.

26254. Speaking of the subsequent experience of schoolmasters that you have acquired as District Inspector, do you think it desirable a portion of the time should be devoted by the teachers in Marlborough street, to what is called the practice of teaching?—Yes, my lord, I think the teachers, before coming up, ought to be well prepared in those subjects that they can learn in the country, so that their attention might be mainly directed to the practical part of their business.

26255. Had you anything to do with their attendance in the practice of teaching either as regards lectures or as regards their attendance in the practicing schools?—Not in the practicing schools, for they did not exist at the time I was there, but in the "museum" I used to give hints as to the method of teaching; teach a class; get them to teach; then take notes of any defects I observed, and, lastly, go over the instruction again myself.

26256. What did you do with the notes you so took? Did you deal with individuals?—Yes; I pointed out to one teacher certain defects in his method, and certain defects to another, and I then invited the criticism of the other teachers.

26257. Did you find the comments you so delivered on the teaching of the school, or on the teaching of these individual teachers, had a beneficial effect?—I believe it had.

26258. Did it often happen that the teachers seemed annoyed or irritated at the comments made on their teaching?—No, my lord. I always mentioned that the criticism was for the benefit of the entire class.

26259. Did you find it annoying—the criticism that you invited from the class itself?—I did not.

26260. Did you find that they were unready to those on whom the criticism was made?—I don't remember any disagreement between the teachers as regards the criticism invited on the teaching of any individual.

26261. Did you find that inviting such criticism was successful in its operation?—Yes, in fact I occasionally got hints myself that way.

26262. Then what classes were those that you summoned to the museum for the teachers to practise on?—They were classes from the model school.

26263. Did you summon them of your own authority, or by previous consultation with the head

master?—The head master had no connexion with the museum. It was separated from the model school.

26264. Were not the children that you brought in for the teachers to practise on children under the control of the head master?—I brought the children for the time I wanted them from the model school up to the museum.

26265. Was that by your own authority or by previous arrangement with the head master?—It was understood by the head master I could get up the classes when I required them to show the teachers how they were to teach them.

26266. Had you anything to do with the supervision of the teachers out of class or after the lecture hours at Marlborough street?—I used to superintend them when teaching classes between two and three o'clock in the model school.

26267. Did you visit the boarding institutions?—I had nothing to say to them. They were under the supervision of the accountant.

26268. What had you to do with the students after lecture hours?—From two to three o'clock they used to be employed in the model school teaching the lesson books, when I used to pass from class to class, hear them teach, and note down their system of teaching. My notes would be taken into account afterwards in their classification.

26269. Had you anything to do with looking after the general behaviour or discipline of the students?—Not as regards those in the general class, except while they were on the premises in Marlborough street, but I had in the case of the special class.

26270. And what were your duties with regard to them?—To see that they attended to their studies in the evening along with the general class in the large model school, that they came in time in the evening and went away at the proper time in the morning from the domestic establishment.

26271. Were you solely responsible for that?—The accountant had general responsibility of all the domestic training establishments.

26272. Was this class specially put under you?—Yes.

26273. Do you think it would be an improvement on the management of the institution in Marlborough street if, instead of the thing being divided between the two professors, there was one principal or head master responsible for the whole thing?—I think it would be desirable to have a couple of heads over it, or to have the heads proportioned to the religious persuasions of the teachers.

26274. If there were two heads over it, how would you secure unity of management, which is essential in a school?—If they were sensible men, and if they had the interest of the establishment at heart, I should say they would agree in their views with regard to all matters connected with the training of the teachers.

26275. Do you think that if the establishment were put under a single head religious differences would arise?—I believe that those who were not represented by that head would be complaining.

26276. Do the generosity of the young men that come up to be trained as teachers possess sufficient knowledge to appreciate professional lectures?—I believe not.

26277. Do you think that it would be desirable

there should be less of professorial lectures and more of individual teaching and questioning.—I believe that the teachers before coming up to be trained ought to pass a strict examination by their Inspectors, and when up that they should not be lectured on grammar, geography, arithmetic, and those subjects which they can learn at home in the country; but that their chief attention should be directed to the practice of teaching. After leaving they might get lectures on the physical sciences and those subjects that are treated of in the lesson books published by the Board.

26278. Do you think that the present time of teaching—six months—is sufficient, or do you think it would be desirable to extend it over a second season?—I would recommend that the teachers should be better prepared before coming up, and kept by the professors to the art of teaching until they saw the result of that change, and afterwards if they did not find the result satisfactory, the training might be extended to a year. I believe myself that a great deal can be done in five months if the teachers are sufficiently prepared beforehand.

26279. A previous witness has stated that a teacher in possession of a school could not stay away longer than six months without running the risk of the school being ruined. Do you consider in that obstacle to the extended training of actual teachers?—I believe the educational system is so developed through the country, that as regards female teachers, it would not be at all difficult to get competent substitutes for the teachers during the time they would be in training.

26280. Do you think it is an advantage to get actual teachers in here after they have certain school experience, or do you think it should be endeavored to get them without any experience before they are actually made schoolmasters?—I believe it is better they should become schoolmasters first and study school accounts, arithmetic, and branches that they can learn at home before they are brought up to be trained. When they come up after two years' teaching in the country they would appreciate all the advantages of the training establishment.

26281. Mr. Stoker.—Does that remark apply to monitors and pupil-teachers as well as to persons who have had no experience?—I would apply it to monitors and pupil-teachers.

26282. The Chairman.—You think it is desirable they should have for six months of a year the practical responsibility of working a school as principal teacher?—I do.

26283. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you think that there would not be a danger of the school falling away from them if they were absent for so long a period?—Those substitutes who came under my observation taught very fairly, and I think the schools would not suffer at all during the time the teachers would be in training.

26284. The Chairman.—Had you many cases of difficulty in maintaining the training of the special class that was under your charge in the model school?—As well as I remember I had not any difficulty with the teachers there.

26285. Are there any points except that of increasing the time devoted to the practice of teaching, on which you would suggest alterations in the management of the schools in Marlborough-street?—I would suggest that there ought to be a museum that should contain all the objects that the teachers have to give instruction on, that these objects in this museum should be accessible to them, and that popular lectures on natural philosophy, the steam engine, physiology, natural history, &c., should be delivered in the evenings to the teachers, so as to enable them fully understand our lesson books, and enable them to teach them well.

26286. Is there any lending library attached to the instruction in Marlborough-street, where teachers in training can borrow books to read in the evening?—The general class had no lending library. I believe the special class had access to a very small library there.

26287. Do you think it would be desirable that a

larger library should be established, of evening and instructive books, to which both the general and special class might have access?—If the training course as to extend only over five months, I don't think it would be at all desirable that the general class should have access to a library except when they would require to refer to a book in order to illustrate anything they were to teach in the model school.

26288. Does it often happen to you to examine a school before the teacher has come up for training in Marlborough-street, and then after the lapse of twelve months to examine him again after he had passed his course in Marlborough-street?—That has frequently happened, but not during the time I have been in the North Dublin district, nor during the last five years I was in Cork.

26289. Is that on account of the prohibition of the bishopric?—On account of the prohibition of the bishopric.

26290. In those cases, where you examined teachers a second time, who had been up to be trained, do you consider that a large proportion of them had benefited by their stay in Marlborough-street?—I don't think they derived much benefit as practical instructors.

26291. In what points of their training did you observe an improvement?—Well, I did not observe an improvement as regards the organization of their schools, nor in the teaching of grammar, geography, or lesson books. I observed, particularly with regard to geography when I got a teacher to examine on it, that there was one system of questioning, such as, "What is a map?" "What is a map a picture of?" I observed that in a great many cases.

26292. Then practically do I gather you did not find they derived much permanent good from their residence in Marlborough-street?—I did not, and in my present district I have had much frequent respect as to the inefficiency and incompetency of trained teachers.

26293. Have you in these reports made any suggestions as to the points that you thought should be modified in the course in Marlborough-street?—I suggested that the professors should not have anything to say to the classification of the teachers. I believe the Head and District Inspectors should classify them according to the merits of their schools, and according to their answering at the annual examinations.

26294. Should you propose that the teachers that remain in Marlborough-street should receive from the professors some sort of ticket, or certificate of the position which they held in that class in Marlborough-street?—Yes, I propose that those who conduct themselves well, and benefit by the instruction there, should get a certificate, which, if their schools went on to the satisfaction of the Inspectors, should entitle them to a step in promotion, and that those that misconduct themselves, or do not improve by the instruction they receive in Marlborough-street, ought not to get any certificate.

26295. Should you propose more than the examination of each class at the end of six months?—I propose the professors should not examine them except to see the progress made by their own instruction, and to see whether they should give the certificate, but that the Head and District Inspectors should examine them, and classify them according to their answering, combined with proficiency in their schools.

26296. Should you propose there should be a formal examination before they left Marlborough-street, not for class, but to place them for proficiency in studies on leaving Marlborough-street?—Yes, the professors ought to examine them entering in and going out, to see the proficiency they made in the interior, and give the certificate or not according to their proficiency and their general conduct.

26297. If they were examined at the end of the half-year to see what proficiency they had made by whom would you suggest that examination should be conducted?—If that examination had no reference to classification, I think it might be entrusted to the professors; but if it related to promotion in classification, I think it should rest entirely with the Head and

Feb. 26, 1862.

Edward Sheehy, esq.

Feb. 22, 1889. District Inspectors, who would know the value of the work done in their schools.

26308. Would you propose to associate with the professors an Inspector or some independent authority in that examination to test what they had been doing during the six months' training?—I think that ought to be left to the professors.

26309. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is it not desirable some one else should be examiner besides the person who has done the work?—Yes, if the teachers were to be classified by the answering for the professors; but we must take into account the object of the examination when determining who are to be the examiners.

26310. If an examination be held in a week or in six months is it not a good thing that the person who examines should not be the school professor who had taught?—I entirely agree in that view of the matter. I think myself that the less the examiner had to do with the teaching the better, the teacher ought not to be examiner, unless to ascertain for himself the results of his teaching.

26311. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In that case what would you regard as the character of the certificate of the professor?—The certificate of the professor would show that those men who held it were well conducted during the time they were in training, and made every effort to improve themselves in schoolmastership and scholarship.

26312. Mr. Wilson.—How many District Inspectors are there?—There are sixty districts, and there is an Inspector to each, but some of these are only acting District Inspectors.

26313. Do you suppose that the Inspectors should be the supreme judge as to the classification of the teachers in training after they leave Marlborough-street?—Yes.

26314. What uniformity of standard in classification would be likely to result from that arrangement?—The same uniformity of standard as we have now in classifying them. At the written examinations we give the same questions.

26315. Do not the Inspectors examine at all?—At the annual examinations?

26316. Do the Inspectors in each district examine the teachers in their districts?—Yes, every year I have an examination of teachers. At Easter I hold the written examination of the male teachers, and then between that and Christmas I hold the oral examination in conjunction with the Head Inspector.

26317. How do the teachers prepare themselves for the annual examination of the Head Inspector?—By studying the Board's books. They know the subjects they are to be examined on, and they study those books.

26318. Is it after the examination of teachers you send forward any one of them for training?—Sometimes after they have been examined in that way they are sent to be trained, and sometimes before it.

26319. Then the trained teacher who comes up has passed an examination by the Inspector?—Yes.

26320. After you have examined the teachers what classification now does the annual inspection outside the room test?—Now the rule is changed; I think it is a very wise change too; the Head and District Inspectors can give first class to teachers on the grounds of efficiency and scholarship.

26321. Then, at present the Inspectors give them first of first?—Yes.

26322. And you are not satisfied with the teachers?—I am quite satisfied that educated teachers, if qualified, can get first class. If teachers in the country can qualify for first class, the Board ought to be more willing to give it to them than to those they go to great expense in bringing up to Dublin to attend the lectures of the professors. I know myself that the professors sent out incompetent teachers to schools—teachers who are not up to the standard of the inspectors.

26323. Have the teachers who have been sent up to the model school ever been sent back for examination when found to be men of very mediocre attain-

ments?—I dare say that might have happened. I was always particular in examining the teachers that came up to be trained.

26324. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is it your opinion that teachers ought to be classified rather according to their power of teaching, and to the work done in the school, than by these literary qualifications?—Decidedly.

26325. Is that the main point of your answer now?—Yes. The work done in the school ought to be the great test; it ought to constitute 75 per cent. of the qualification of the teacher in giving him promotion.

26326. You think it is not advisable for young men to go on reading, so as to pass a literary examination, for many years after they have charge of schools?—I have always encouraged the teacher to study, and I have taught them to examination, thinking they would improve in their studies when they expected to be examined; because the more they know the better teachers they become.

26327. Would not this effect follow, that such men would be more intent on improving their own scholarship than improving the work of the school?—I do not believe that to be the case.

26328. Have you found that to be the case?—In several instances I found teachers of a lower grade had produced better results in their schools than those of a higher grade. I believe many of the first class teachers, when they get the highest class sleep on their oars, and did not work in their schools.

26329. It seems to me you had a remedy—reprimanding them, or removing them, if they did not do their duty. The point is, does the man who is trying to get to higher class neglect his school in improving himself to pass the examination?—No; for the Inspector is obliged to certify to the Board that as his school is up to a certain point; that it is satisfactory, as regards accounts, organization, and progress of senior and junior classes.

26330. Is that absolutely essential?—It is necessary. We have to certify that in the beginning of each year.

26331. Now, is that certificate given by the Inspector with great care, or is it done as a matter of course?—I think myself it is given with care.

26332. But with special care?—Yes, I give it myself with special care.

26333. Is it your experience generally that the teachers who are put forward in that way for examination pass that preliminary ordeal satisfactorily? I understood you a while ago to offer to some teachers that were getting higher in their classification?—Yes, and these same teachers passed through that ordeal when they were mere probationers.

26334. Does it occur only once this certificate of good conduct?—This occurs every year.

26335. May I ask you now, if a teacher wishes to go in for examination to improve his position as a certificated teacher, is it not preliminary that his school shall be thoroughly efficient?—Yes.

26336. Is that preliminary rigidly insisted on all cases by the Inspectors before they recommend the teacher to go in for improvement of his position?—Yes, and when this certificate is sent up to the office in Dublin it is compared with the Inspector's report on his school for the preceding twelve months.

26337. Would you describe your system as one in which successful school-keeping, as well as literary qualification, enables a man to rise?—Yes.

26338. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—As a matter of fact, do the Inspectors attach as much importance to efficient school-keeping as to literary qualifications?—I myself attach more importance to the work done in the school than to the literary qualification.

26339. Mr. Stokes.—Have you found instances in which the teachers have devoted to their own preparation for examination the time that is due to their schools?—In one instance I met a first class teacher, who had a book on his desk, which I believe he was studying. I did not actually catch him studying the book. I did not find his classes in a satisfactory state when I examined them.



26330. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—He was in a low division of first class—I cannot tell the division. He could get higher.

26331. Mr. Stoker.—In schools employing assistants and monitors, it is not sometimes difficult to detect neglect on the part of the head teacher—I think so, but I have adopted this plan myself, in order to make the head teacher, the assistant, and monitor employ their time in school well. I generally give the head teacher special charge of senior division, and general charge of the whole school; to the assistant, if there be one, I give the middle division; and to the paid monitor the lowest division, and then I repose on the head teacher the duty of examining the lower divisions from time to time to see how the assistant and monitor conduct them.

26332. Do you bear in mind the description which Mr. McCready gave in his report for 1830? I should like to know how far such a description applies at present. He describes the teachers themselves as a body not punctual in their observance of the hours of opening and closing school, and he says—

"Were they to give themselves wholly and undividedly to the instruction of their pupils when in school, and not frantically (for it is nothing less) oversee whole houses, as many of them do, by looking to minutes of another sort, such as reading newspapers, writing letters for themselves or others, making out accounts, carrying the books last surveyed by them, reading those programmes for next examinations, and lastly smoking, a practice very general with the male teachers, and in the ignorance of which they consume a great amount of time. The schools to which these details refer, far from being what one would willingly believe these of more pretensions, or of others of inferior classification only, are the two-thirds of them under first and second-class teachers, of whose agents more than the one-half are of the former class, and therefore, necessarily tainted."

I believe that report is partly true, but as the main, it is untrue as regards the teachers of my districts. I believe it is true as regards the want of punctuality in attendance in the morning, but not in the other respects. Some time ago I suggested to one of the officers connected with the central establishment, that we ought to have an attendance book in every National school throughout the country, in which the teacher, the assistant, and monitor, should enter their names, and the time they arrive at the school every morning, in order to prevent late attendance. I had attendance books in several schools in Cork. If I went to a school, and found the teacher five or ten minutes late, the usual excuse was that it was the only day he or she was late. To show me that they were not in the habit of coming late, they agreed to keep an attendance book.

26333. But you do not believe they read news papers—I do not believe they read newspapers in the schools.

26334. You do not believe that the time they ought to devote to the schools, they are engaged studying the programme for the next examination?—I do not. I believe want of punctuality in the morning attendance, which payment by results would prevent, is one of the defects in our schools.

26335. Mr. Gibbes.—Under your system, I suppose the teachers in the country would require some time to study for the examination by the Inspector?—Yes.

26336. What guarantee had you that they would not take up as much time then as they do now; what does a master to the teacher whether he be examined down in the country or up here. They must devote a certain time in study to gain the necessary appointment?—Might I ask you to repeat the question. (Question repeated.) I did not propose that they should be examined in Dublin for classification. I proposed that when they went back to the country they should be examined by the Inspectors, and classified according to their answering and the results produced in their schools.

26337. As I understood you, you stated that the teacher spent time preparing for an examination that ought to be devoted to school duties. Do you mean in the training in the country?—I stated no such

thing; for the teachers can study from the time they leave their schools—from three o'clock in the evening until nine or ten at night, and again in the morning.

26338. You mentioned that you found some men studying a book. For what examination was he studying?—I think that is the only instance that I remember—that is the only exceptional case where I found a teacher studied for an examination in school.

26339. Then these teachers would be altogether self-taught?—Yes; as regards those subjects they were not taught as pupils, monitors, and pupil-teachers, such as logic, trigonometry, mechanics, &c. Teachers self-taught in the country would afterwards make greater progress in their studies than men of the same standing who had the advantage of attending the professor's lectures.

26340. But all the advancement which they acquire from the time of their last examination up to the time when they came before you for examination, might according to your system be acquired by themselves?—Yes.

26341. I thought you said they had great difficulty in carrying away what they got?—Of their practical schoolmastery.

26342. Now, supposing the classification of teachers was altogether in the hands of Inspectors below, would it not be a check upon Inspectors in the country, if after they had classified the teachers below, those teachers should be sent up for examination to the professors in the model schools, to see whether or not there was a proper standard applied?—The Head Inspector is a check upon the District Inspector, and the District Inspector is a check upon the Head Inspector.

26343. But the Head Inspector would have the absolute control of the classification?—No, it is a very good arrangement to have the Head Inspector check the District Inspector and vice versa. When I mark the written exercises at Easter, they are all sent to the Head Inspector for revision; and at the oral examination, I am associated with the Head Inspector in examining.

26344. Supposing the standard in one district would differ from that in another, what guarantee would the public have?—That opens another question. I believe myself, that the Inspectors so far as the oral examinations are concerned, have different standards. And I believe that before the training of the teachers we should look after the training of the Inspectors, and that they should all adopt the one standard. I do not think it is sufficient for an Inspector to pass a competitive examination, he should also undergo a course of practical schoolmastery in the model schools.

26345. Have a great many Inspectors done so?—Yes, a good many.

26346. A good many have been teachers under the Board?—Yes, I had charge of the central model school for years.

26347. And other schools?—Yes, I was first class teacher before I was twenty years of age.

26348. You think the Inspectors ought to be trained?—Yes.

26349. To whom would you give the training of the Inspectors?—That matter requires consideration.

26350. Have you not considered it?—I have not, but a practicing school could be provided for the Inspectors, where they should be got to teach all the subjects they would require to examine on afterwards in the country.

26351. To whom would you give the examination of the Inspectors in teaching?—If there were practical and clever professors they would be very suitable persons for the Inspectors after their appointment, to be trained under.

26352. Mr. Stokes.—Have you looked at the papers set to the candidates for Inspectors at the competitive examination?—Yes.

26353. What is your religion?—Roman Catholic.

26354. Do you consider that the papers set at those competitive examinations for Inspectorships are

Feb 20, 1868.

Edward Sheehy, esq.

Feb 20, 1867, for as between the Catholic and Protestant candidates—I have not seen the questions to be answered, but the mere programme.

26355. Your attention has not been called to the fact that the questions are taken out of books which in some cases have been published by the Catholic Church?—No.

26356. Mr. Gilson.—These complaints you have referred to, have you ever embodied them in any reports to the Commissioners?—I have made frequent complaints in my reports to the Commissioners about the inefficiency and incompetency of teachers in my present district.

26357. Would you refer me to any?—I made a very unfavorable report upon the Kinsale National school, in the parish of Ballyke. I believe the teacher there is deficient in grammar, geography, and in the art of school-keeping—in keeping the children quiet, and in being pleasing to them, I said she was only fit to be a nurse, instead of a National teacher.

26358. What was her class?—First of them, but she had been second of several till deposed by another Inspector. I can mention a number of cases. There was another trained and classed teacher out at Finglas. I saw that the boys could not answer upon the map of Ireland. I said, “Do you teach the map of Ireland?” He said “I do.” “I suppose you know it well yourself,” said I, “what is the chief town of Tyrone?” I don’t pledge myself to the exact words, but the answer he gave me was Antrim. I asked him the chief town of Antrim, and I think he said Donegal. I asked him the chief towns of Leitrim, and he said Mayo. I purposely selected counties with chief towns different in name. He wound up by telling me that Tipperary was the chief town of Clare.

26359. What was his classification?—Second of third.

26360. That is the very lowest?—The very lowest.

26361. Had he ever passed an Inspector before he got the classification?—I am not aware.

26362. Was he classified by an Inspector?—I believe he was, but at any rate he passed the professors and received a course of training. I presume, in geography, and in the map of Ireland. That was the result of the training.

26363. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Did you ever hear if he could draw out a map of Ireland upon a slate or paper?—That is a system very much adopted in Germany, and we adopt it sometimes at our written examinations. The teacher is asked to map down the county in which his school is situated, with the adjoining counties. Some years ago I used to get the teachers, when examining on Ireland, to dot down Dublin, draw a line representing the coast, mark off Wicklow and Wexford, then draw the rivers and mountains in those counties, and dot down the towns. I believe it is a very excellent method of teaching geography.

26364. Mr. Gilson.—I want to know whether you embodied in the reports a general charge of incompetency, for it must be considered against the training establishment, or referred only to particular instances?—I referred to these matters in the report for 1867.

26365. What report?—In the report of which I got a copy last night I stated in a general way these matters.

26366. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In your report for 1867 did you make a statement with regard to No. 30 District—the North Dublin—that is your district?—Yes.

26367. Did you make the following statement in that report?—“I am too short a time in charge of the North Dublin district to give an opinion as to whether or not the teachers of it are improving as instructors of youth and as school-keepers, but I am sufficiently long to be able to state that the great majority of them are very attentive to their school duties, and very many of them industrious and efficient, whilst on the other hand there are several classed and trained whose inefficiency and incompetency I had occasion to refer to in my ordinary reports on these schools.” Is that yours?—That is my report.

26368. That generally applies to the teachers in

your district?—That applies to the teachers in my district. I stated in another part of that report that it would be very difficult for a person to estimate whether the training establishment had done more harm or good to the schools in the very district in which it is situated.

26369. Read the immediately succeeding passage?—“It would be very difficult to estimate whether the training establishment has done more harm or more good to the National schools of the district in which it is situated. If the qualifications of many of the teachers be very poor the emancipation is equally so. The Dublin teachers are poor, on account of the expense they are under by living in a large city and also on account of the very poorest children who cannot pay fees attending the Dublin schools. As a rule the larger the city the poorer the pupils are that attend our National schools.”

26370. Could you say that most of the teachers you speak of were trained and classed?—Yes, I have as much on the subject. I beg to remind you that the report from which the extracts were read was written for 1867; I have had additional experience since I wrote it, and the result of that experience is embodied in this return which I have here of trained and untrained teachers, and their efficiency in these schools.

26371. Mr. Gilson.—Was that return made to the Board, or was it made for this examination?—I made it for this examination, but it is taken from the Board’s documents, which I have had before me.

26372. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—And is globe is likely to be presented in disfigure to the Commissioners?—It is not specially asked for. We used to give in our annual reports more detailed accounts with regard to teachers than we have done for the last two or three years. As we are not now asked to give so many details about them, I did not embody this return in my annual reports.

26373. Mr. Dease.—Are the figures in that return to be found in the published papers of the Board?—They are taken from my district book, in which I have on account of the schools of my district, and a summary of my own reports on them. This gives the ages, dates of appointments, qualifications, classifications, and dates of training.

26374. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have the facts embodied in the papers before you been transmitted by you to the office in Marlborough-street?—Yes, in this way—when I was reporting on a school I gave the teacher’s age and classification, and so on; and this is a summary from these reports of the 101 trained teachers, and fifty-six untrained teachers in my district.

26375. The Chairman.—Is that male or female, or both?—Both, and also, both principal and assistant teachers.

26376. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—By “trained teachers,” are we to understand teachers trained in Marlborough-street?—Trained in Marlborough-street, either as interns or externs.

26377. What is the result of the general efficiency of these trained teachers?—Here it is, after a careful comparison, I found that of the 101 trained teachers twenty-two are good, ten of the untrained teachers are good, of the trained thirty-nine are fair, and of the untrained teachers thirty-six are fair, twenty-five of the trained teachers are middling, and four of the untrained teachers are middling, of the trained teachers fifteen are bad, and of the untrained teachers six are bad.

26378. What is the general result?—The results are, putting the two classes under four heads—trained teachers, twenty-two good, thirty-nine fair, twenty-five middling, and fifteen bad. Untrained teachers, ten good, thirty-six fair, four middling, and six bad. If I were to compute these numbers I find there is a greater proportion of the trained teachers bad than of the untrained. It is a remarkable fact that some of the best teachers in my district are untrained. The Manor-street female school, under the patronage of the Sisters of Charity, but taught by lay teachers who are untrained, is one of the best schools in my district.

Feb. 20, 1869.

Edward  
Knox, c.q.

26377. Of course you have made your representations to the Commissioners in connection with your reports and answers to different questions—do you think these matters have been brought under the notice of the Commissioners?—Well, sometimes I am present to the teachers in the reports, and instead of having official action taken on them, I think it more judicious and more conducive to the interests of the school to see the managers and get them to reprimand the teachers and threaten them with dismissal unless they improve their schools, I did that in Cork as well as Dublin. I believe I got fewer recommendations and fires inflicted upon teachers than perhaps any other Inspector.

26378. You have had considerable experience both in connection with the central institution, and also as Inspector?—Yes.

26379. What is your opinion as to the desirability of continuing such a training institution?—I am myself in favour of having the training institution kept on, but I was always of opinion it could be greatly improved, and when I was there myself I laboured to improve it.

26380. In what way?—I laboured very hard with the teachers. At the opening up of each course I was most anxious to have the Commissioners present, and to examine before them, but the professors and the assistant professor, Mr. Rees, did everything in their power to prevent these examinations. The Lord Lieutenant attended on two or three occasions, and Mr. Gibson and other Commissioners were present. I believe that on those occasions they were pleased with the answering of the teachers for some of the answers.

26381. I think you said that in your opinion the teachers should be better prepared before coming up for training?—Yes.

26382. How better prepared, and where?—Often-times when teachers asked me to recommend them for training, I would examine them on grammar, geography, arithmetic, &c., and if they missed my questions, I would have no idea of sending them to be trained, because in trying to learn these subjects at head-quarters, they would neglect the practical and important part of their training.

26383. In your report from which passage have been used you say “the practice of allowing candidates to attend instruction given by the professors to teachers in training, and of classifying these candidates afterwards has done great injury to the schools of my district, as it led to the appointment of many of them to schools which they are quite unfit to conduct.” You don’t mean by that statement to condemn the training institution?—I do not. What I wish is to check and prevent that practice. I have made up my mind, and I have recently noted upon it, to examine every teacher that comes into my district, whether he is trained or untrained. Because, the Dublin schools—I may mention I heard it from Mr. Hunter and Dr. Newell—are some of the worst in Ireland. One way is to remedy that great defect is to try and keep out all the incompetent teachers, and therefore I am determined to examine every teacher who comes into the district, whether he is trained or untrained. The rules of the Board allow it.

26384. Have you discovered why the students in your district are so inferior?—The practice of classifying candidates is one of the great evils.

26385. Would not that apply to all districts?—No, in Cork I had few extern teachers. One appointed to the Rev. Dr. Webster’s school in Cork—was brought into examination, and though she was second of several, and twice trained, yet she could not show me Holographs. The Dublin district specially suffers, because it is so near to the training establishment. The teachers in training hear of every vacancy about Dublin—Their friends, good-hearted people, give them strong recommendations; but it is the duty of the Inspector to examine in all these cases before allowing them into the district.

26386. Should we understand your objection is more to the classification by the professors than to

the training of the candidates?—I am not at all opposed to training. I am for improving the training, and I am for having the teachers classified by the professors, so long as they are allowed to class them, according to the standards adopted by the Inspectors.

26387. Can they?—They can.

26388. The Chairman.—Do you think it would be a good thing to leave the joint action you speak of for the examination to be conducted by one or two professors and an Inspector or Head-Inspector?—Well, I think it would be very good, my lord, as the Head and District Inspectors would be a check on the professors. I am a check upon the Head Inspector, and he is a check upon me, and our examinations are combined examinations. I am present at every question he asks at the oral examination, and he is present at every question I ask. After I mark the written exercises I send them to the Head Inspector, and they are revised by him; and upon the scholarship and the state of the schools we classify the teachers.

26389. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have not the Head and District Inspectors an advantage the professors don’t possess?—A great advantage as regards classification, because the professors have nothing whatever of their efficiency. Take the case of a very studious teacher; he is brought into the model school to be examined in a hasty manner, and answers well in the lecture-room. If the professors were to classify him upon his teaching or examination of the class, and upon his own answering, they would give him a high class, but that man may go to the country, and be idle and inefficient in his school. The other day I found a trained first of first class teacher at Malahide, who had his school in a wretched state. I spoke to the manager about him. I did not like to get him fired or dismissed, but I believe the manager got rid of him in a very short time, as he did not improve the pupils, nor keep himself or the school clean. The manager got an untrained teacher to succeed him, and the contrast between the state of the school now, and under the trained teacher, is marvellous.

26390. So that the Head and District Inspectors have an advantage, from their personal knowledge of the efficiency of the teachers—of his schoolmastership—where the professors have not?—That is so.

26391. Do you regard the Inspectors as well qualified and as capable as the professors are of classifying the teachers?—Well, I believe some of the Inspectors are not qualified, but now they have to enter the Board’s service by passing a competitive examination. So far as literary qualifications are concerned they are qualified.

26392. Should you not regard the Inspectors as well qualified for their office?—Yes, those that pass the examination now, but Inspectors did enter the Board’s service who were never examined nor trained.

26393. Should you not regard the Inspectors’ examination as well calculated to produce uniformity in the classification as classification by the professors?—Yes, but until the Inspectors are all trained themselves, until they have certain fixed ideas about the practical working of schools, and until they are up to a certain standard themselves, you will not have uniformity as regards the oral examination. In the written examination there may be uniformity, because the questions are all alike, and they are obliged to work them according to a certain scale.

26394. In the view you have stated as to classification a view generally held by Inspectors?—I believe the Inspectors are satisfied they are the parties who ought to classify the teachers, as they are the parties who know the worth of the teachers in their schools.

26395. Rev. Mr. Cruise.—Are you authorized to state that on the part of other Inspectors, or is that merely your own opinion?—I am not authorized to state it, but I have had frequent intercourse with Inspectors, and spoken to them about it.

26396. You have gathered that?—I have.

26397. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I see you have the following in your 1868 report:—“I should have mentioned that the central model and practicing schools of the

Feb. 22, 1899.

Edward  
Sheehy, Esq.

Board are in any district, but they are not under my superintendence, nor indeed under that of any other Inspector?—Yes, and the professors were obliged to examine these schools, and have never examined them, except on one occasion. I have mentioned frequently to some of the people there that of the smallest school in the most remote part of Ireland there is far more known than of the central schools.

26409. Are they under any effective superintendence?—No.

26410. Is that a great disadvantage?—Great disadvantage.

26411. Under whose superintendence should they be?—If I were to say they should be under an Inspector, it might be imagined I was wishing the inspection of these schools myself, but I am speaking in the abstract, and I say they ought to be under the Head and District Inspectors. Pending that arrangement, I think the professors ought to examine these schools.

26412. Now, Mr. Carson: Are you aware that the model schools in connexion with the training schools in England are always visited by the District Inspector, and reported upon the same as any other schools?—Yes, and all the other model schools throughout Ireland. The Head Inspector and myself spent eight days, or forty-two hours, examining the West Dublin model school, and noting down and tabulating the answering of the pupils.

26413. Mr. Gibson: Are you not aware there is a report presented every week to the Commissioners respecting these schools?—Yes; but that is a mere table of figures. It does not tell how the pupils answer, or how the school is progressing—it merely tells how they are classified, the number admitted, and so on. When I say the Commissioners know less about the central model schools than about the smallest school in the most remote locality, I mean they receive no reports of the answering of the classes, such as these the Inspectors transmit on all the other schools.

26415. Is it your opinion that nothing can be known about a school except an Inspector reports on it?—Not at all. I think the professors could examine the schools.

26416. Rev. Dr. Wilson: Do they?—They do not. They were only examined on one occasion, and that was by Mr. McGeeley.

26417. Mr. Sullivan: How many years ago is that?—In 1854. It was I myself who did it.

26418. As a matter of fact the public at present have no means of getting any official information with regard to the state of the central model school?—No. If you ask the Board to-morrow how the school was conducted, say five years ago, or any time, or in any other head master's time, they have no means of answering the question, they have no means of knowing how it was conducted at any former period.

26419. Mr. Stokes: Except tables of figures?—Yes; and what use are tables of figures? I maintain you must have two things—you must have a searching examination of the school accounts to see how long the pupils remain in their class, and besides that you must have the results of the examination of the pupils before you can come to any conclusion respecting the progress of a school. If I go into a school to-morrow, and examine the children, though they might answer very well, yet I could not tell from their answering whether the school was progressing or not, unless I had the accounts before me and saw how long they had been in their classes.

26420. Rev. Dr. Wilson: Should you be able from the figures to furnish to the public a history of the schools?—Do you mean with regard to the central model schools?

26421. Yes?—I would not.

26422. Mr. Gibson: Are you not aware that the schools were very frequently, when Mr. Macdonnell was in strength and vigor, visited by him?—Yes, and I believe you have visited the schools very often, too. But if you want to know the state of the

schools, it is not a visitor coming in for an hour, but an Inspector who comes in at ten o'clock and remains till three or four, examining every class, and looking into all the accounts you must ask.

26423. Rev. Dr. Wilson: Is there an inspection, or anything approaching inspection, by any Commissioner of National Education of the schools?—Well, my knowledge of them is limited to six years. They were not examined in my time by any Commissioner.

26424. Mr. Gibson: Did you ever request an examination of the schools?—I did not; but I frequently examined the schools myself. I had the honor of examining them for the Queen when she came, and I examined them for two or three Lords Lieutenant.

26425. How long was Her Majesty in the schools?—I suppose three quarters of an hour. The subjects which the head class was taught were mentioned, certain ones were pointed out, and I examined on them.

26426. You never yourself represented during those six years the disadvantage of having a formal inspection?—Yes; I mentioned a while ago that I urged on the late Professor McGeeley to hold an examination.

26427. Was that when you were there yourself?—When I was in the training department, assistant to the professor.

26428. Rev. Dr. Wilson: I see a reference in the report for 1867, to two schools which were taken into consideration in the autumn of that year—the Manor street school, and the Josephine infant school?—Yes.

26429. The report states that these schools were established by Sisters of Charity, who visit them daily to give religious instruction, and the children are educated by lay teachers, who receive a salary from the Board, and from the pupils: do you regard these as efficient schools?—Yes, the Manor street school was the schools I referred to a while ago. The teacher is a Miss Maguire, who, I believe, is the most efficient of the ordinary teachers in my district, and she is retained.

26430. Do you regard that as a satisfactory arrangement—the Sisters of Charity attending to the religious instruction, and lay teachers to the secular?—Yes, the lay teachers join in the religious instruction.

26431. Who are the persons that give literary instruction?—The lay teachers and their assistants.

26432. Do you find both departments attended to, and the results satisfactory?—I cannot speak as to the religious instruction, as I do not examine on religious subjects; but I presume it is. On literary subjects I did examine, and I was greatly pleased.

26433. Rev. Mr. Carson: You have referred to public examinations before visitors: are you not of opinion that no value whatever should be set upon public examinations of schools before visitors?—I am, unless conducted in this way. If there is a programme of the subjects written out, and the visitor picks out particular subjects, I think, then, that if the Inspector or examiner keeps the pupils to those subjects, that is a pretty fair test of the answering of the pupils; but if the teachers have the selection of the subjects, or the selection of the classes, such an examination is in my opinion worthless.

26434. If it is necessary to have public examinations, or that the public should be invited to see how the children get on, would it not be better that the results of the previous examination should be read out, and occasional answers taken from the papers, or things of that kind, which would be the result of a bona fide examination, and that that examination should not be conducted by the persons who are teachers of the school?—Yes, I believe myself that the teachers, as a rule, should have nothing to say to the examinations. In the ordinary schools, not to speak of the West Dublin Model, I examine every class myself, and when a class is examined by the teacher, I stand beside him to see how he examines it, for we are obliged to report as the teacher's mode of instructing the class.

26435. With respect to the classing of teachers by certificates, would it not be better there should be a general examination held once or twice a year if necessary, and that the examination papers should be prepared

by the Chief Inspector, so as to have some uniform system of examination and classification?—Certainly, and in our present system of examination there is a uniformity secured, inasmuch as the same questions are given to the male teachers on the same days in the different districts.

26436. Are the papers looked on by any central committee?—They are looked over by the District Inspectors, and revised by the Head Inspectors.

26437. How many persons are examined at one of these examinations on an average?—I believe in 1867 we had about thirty or forty female teachers, and last year, I examined seven or eight male teachers, but only three of them made their appearance at the examination.

26438. That was in your own district?—Yes, there only made their appearance and these were not recalled to the oral examination as their written exercises were not set up to the mark.

26439. Your examination only lasts one day?—The written examination lasts two days for the male teachers, one day for the females.

26440. How long did it take you to read the papers of these teachers?—I suppose it took me six or eight days to read the exercises of the male and female teachers. We are allowed that time; but when I say "reading them over" we have to do various other things: we are obliged to translate the answering into a certain form; to turn over our note-books and see how their classes were conducted since we sent in our certificate recommending them to be summoned for examination; and to record their answering so as to be consulted with their scholarship.

26441. Do you allow any others besides those actually in charge of National schools to come to these examinations?—Yes, some have come from the West Dublin Model school and some from convent schools for examination.

26442. There were persons engaged in teaching who were under the Board?—Yes, persons who had been for years masters and who wanted to be classed.

26443. But suppose a person teaching a school in no way connected with the Board wished to qualify himself?—We never summon them to examination.

26444. Though you do not summon them would you if they asked allow them to come? Well, the one has not arisen. Sometimes a person has come to me and said "I would like to get a certificate, &c." I examined him and gave him a certificate.

26445. But not in the same formal manner?—Not in the same formal manner.

26446. No person can have a certificate of competency to teach unless actually under the Board or in charge of some school under the Board?—No; when a teacher is appointed as a probationer—

26447. To a school under the Board?—Yes, he is obliged to be examined by the Inspector, who has to send in a certificate as to his competency.

26448. The Chairman.—Have you ever had occasion to examine teachers who have been trained in Kildare-place under the Church Education Society, and subsequently become National teachers?—I have examined some of the Church Education Society's teachers but not many of them. I cannot call to mind whether they were trained or not, but they had been teaching Church Education schools.

26449. What would you say as to their efficiency?—I found some of them very inefficient. I found one very competent.

26450. Have you any such person in your present district?—I have one in the Richmond Linnick Asylum school who has never been classed by an Inspector, which is a very unusual thing; for in the district I have had charge of every teacher should qualify for a class. I believe the teacher I refer to was trained in Kildare-place under the Church Education Society for some time.

26451. Mr. Deane.—Have you got any other cases of the same interesting nature as that of the teacher who thought Tipperary the chief town of Clack?—I found one at Ballylough who was greatly ignorant of the map of Ireland.

26452. Was she a trained teacher?—Yes, she was trained and classed as an extern. I had to report very unfavorably of her, and eventually she had to leave the school. I have now got another teacher in her place, and from an average of thirty, which it had under her, there has been an increase to an average of eighty.

26453. Have you many schools in your district taught by nuns?—I have two schools where nuns teach, and four where there are lay teachers under the patronage of nuns. One of the former schools has produced a great number of teachers, in fact it produced twenty-nine in a year, whereas the Cook Model school and West Dublin Model school, with which I have in connection been connected for the last three or four years, did not produce a single teacher.

26454. Have you had an opportunity of judging of the personal efficiency of the religious engaged in teaching?—I have. I have gone into their schools frequently and unexpectedly, and I always found them instructing their pupils, who answered uncommonly well.

26455. Do you consider the nuns efficient teachers, as a general rule?—As a general rule I find them efficient. I had seven large convent schools in Cork; and some of these were admirably conducted, such as the schools at Kinsale, Midleton, and Quininstown, others were very well conducted, others fairly conducted.

26456. Do they conduct the greater part, or a large part of the education themselves, or do they leave it to the monitors?—They constantly teach themselves, and they teach the monitors. Some of their monitors have become the best teachers under the Board, and at their examinations, after they had charge of their schools only seven or eight months, answered better than the trained first class teachers.

26457. How long is it since you left Cook?—I left Cook two years ago.

26458. Had you anything to say to the inspection of the model farm near there?—I had to examine nearly all the students that were admitted to the model farm on a certain programme of literary subjects and to sign a certificate for each, which, along with a certificate from a medical man and a certificate from the patron of each candidate, were sent up to the Board, who then admitted the candidates to the model farm.

26459. Was the general management—what many call the social management—of the establishment under your superintendence?—That was chiefly under the Agricultural Inspector, Mr. Baldwin.

26460. The internal management of the institution?—That was under the agriculturalist.

26461. Did it come under your observation officially or otherwise, that unpleasant difference arose between the agricultural and literary teachers in that school?—Yes, on two or three occasions during the time I was there, and the literary teacher, in one instance, had to leave.

26462. Do you think that arose from there being a sort of divided mastership in the establishment?—Yes, I think there was a rivalry between the literary and agricultural heads of the establishment at the time.

26463. Mr. Sullivan.—As District Inspector, had you anything to do with the examination of pupils in the agricultural school after they got in?—I examined them on literary subjects, about three times a year; and the Agricultural Inspector went down about three or four times a year and examined them on agricultural subjects.

26464. The Chairman.—How did they perform at your examinations?—They did very fairly. Some who were admitted before they were qualified in literary subjects did not go so well. Any I examined myself, who were not up to the programme, I rejected, recommending them to go to some National teacher, and get ground by him until qualified to pass the entrance examination.

26465. Mr. Sullivan.—You have had to do with the Cook model school?—Yes, for about a year and five months.

26466. What class of persons attended that school?—There were respectable children attending it—sons

Feb 26, 1868.

—  
Edward  
Stanley, esq.

Feb. 29, 1862. of the sub-inspector of police, who lately became a stipendiary magistrate, and sons of merchants, used to attend the model school. In fact the boys attending the model school were of a far higher position than those attending the ordinary schools in the city.

26457. Do you mean the ordinary pay schools?—I mean the ordinary National school in the city.

26458. The *Glenview*.—Was there any admittance of poor children in that school?—There was.

26459. What proportion of the whole do you suppose the poor children of children formed?—If I were to make an estimate, I should say a fourth of the whole were poor children.

26460. Do you know the school on the Glasnevin road, Cork, attached to the Presbyterian church?—Yes, that is in connexion with the Board.

26461. I mean the Catholic school?—Yes.

26462. What was the character of the attendance at that?—It was a small attendance. The school itself is small.

26463. Were they all Presbyterians?—I believe there was a mixture of Established Church and Presbyterians. I do not think any Roman Catholics attended it. As well as I remember the terms at that school were high—much higher than those charged in the ordinary National schools in other parts of the city.

26464. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I presume the desire of the manager was that the teacher should receive a fair amount of fees from the children?—Yes, the teacher received the fees from the children.

26465. Were there any Wesleyan or Independent children there?—I cannot say. My impression is there was a mixture of Established Church and Presbyterian children.

26466. Mr. Sullivan.—Practically, it was a mixed school, though no Roman Catholics attended it?—I believe no Roman Catholics attended it.

26467. Would the character of the attendance at the model school at Cork explain the non-production of teachers?—would it explain the fact that no teachers were sent out from it?—I think the reason no teachers were sent out from it was because it was opposed by the Roman Catholic bishop. Anyone attending that school would not get a situation in the schools paid about, either under Dr. Delany, or under Dr. Keane, in the adjoining diocese.

26468. Then the majority of the schools in that diocese were under the patronage of priests?—Yes.

26469. Consequently, unless a teacher trained in the Cork model school got a lay patron, he would have no chance of employment?—He would not.

26470. Does that explanation apply also to the case of the West Dublin Model school?—Yes, we have a lot of pupil-teachers and monitors there, but they cannot get a school in the city. I have been asked by managers to get them teachers who were trained before 1862, as they could not take any who have been trained since. At Chapelizod, there was a vicar who the other day, when the manager spoke to me about getting him a teacher, and told me he would not take any teachers who had been trained since 1862. I sent him an authorized teacher, who, in a few months, has produced the most satisfactory results.

26471. So that practically, the supply of teachers from the model schools may be said to be practically cut off?—It is practically cut off. There may be some exceptional cases of Roman Catholic managers taking teachers trained since 1862. In the West Dublin Model School there are pupil teachers who must leave the establishment after having spent several years in training there. They can get no employment whatever as National teachers—they are in fact worse off than beggars, for they have been trained up to a certain profession, and there is no employment for them in it, they won't be taken into any of the National schools.

26472. When you were in Marlborough-street, what was the proportion of Roman Catholics trained there

as teachers?—About three-fourths of the class were Roman Catholics and one-fourth Protestants.

26473. Of that proportion what number would represent real teachers of schools?—At that time nearly all were real teachers. There were some exceptional cases of pupil-teachers who came up from distinct model schools after one or two years' training; but in nearly every case they were bona fide teachers, who had been teaching schools in the country, were recommended by the Inspector, and sanctioned up to training.

26474. Could you give any estimate of the proportion of pupil-teachers who form the excepted class?—No. I could give you an idea of the number of pupil-teachers that attend now as compared with the actual teachers.

26475. I should wish you to give them?—I think it was Professor Butler handed me this printed return, which gives the names of the teachers, their schools, &c. I have examined it, and find that out of seventy-five male teachers in training in the spring of 1867, twenty-seven were principal teachers, and twenty-two assistants—there are bona fide teachers—there was an assistant, one pupil-teacher, ten paid monitors, thirteen pupils, and one seagull. Moreover, there were ten who had been trained before. That was never allowed under the old system. When I was in Marlborough-street, teachers were never allowed to go back a second time, unless to a special class.

26476. Are persons you have named in the general class?—Yes, this is the general class of male teachers.

26477. What reason is given for allowing them to be retained?—There is no reason assigned. I believe the reason is that some of those bona fide teachers cannot go back to their schools, and then of course they are taken back to the training department, as they have no school to go to. In Cork, for instance, I used to retain the names of teachers for training twice a year. Two teachers went up against the will of their managers, and when they went back they could not get their schools. I believe one applied to get into the special class. I don't know whether the other got any situation afterwards. Here in Dublin I have recommended, I suppose, about fourteen teachers during 1867 and 1868 for training, but out of these only two were trained. One of those two who came up was under a Protestant manager, and got back to his school; but the other was under a Roman Catholic manager, and not being allowed back to his school, went to some other employment.

26478. The remainder you recommended were not sent up?—They were sanctioned, but they would not be allowed to come up. More than that—a very unusual thing—I got instructions to write to these teachers to state that they were sanctioned but the managers might not convey the sanction to them, and when I sent those communications to the teachers some of the managers were very indignant that the Inspector should be communicating directly with the teachers instead of in the regular way, communicating with them through the managers.

26479. Who made the communication to them?—Well, it came from the secretaries.

26480. It was a regular official document?—Yes.

26481. Has that been a usual course?—It never occurred before. During the present course of business a circular was sent to me and the other Inspectors asking us to recommend pupil-teachers to all up vacancies in the present class.

26482. Mr. Stokes.—Could the Commissioners have a copy of the document?—I have not got it about me, but I can send you a copy of it.

26483. Mr. Sullivan.—You say the managers complained of that?—Yes, I have some of the teachers' letters, where they say the managers were not pleased at all that I should write to them saying they had been sanctioned, that they had already mentioned

\* Copies of the letters referred to by the witness will be found at the close of this day's evidence, page 1174.

Feb. 29, 1864.  
—  
Edward Stuby, esq.

to the teachers they were summoned, but would not allow them to come up.

26484. Mr. Gibson.—Were these managers clergymen?—Yes.

26485. The Chairman.—Are there any teachers in your district receiving money from the Department of Science and Art?—No.

26486. Mr. Sullivan.—What has been your experience with regard to the teachers in the employment of the Board, who have been trained in convent schools, as to their qualifications?—My experience of them is that they have turned out generally very good teachers.

26487. Does that experience apply as well to Cork as to Dublin?—Yes, both to Cork and Dublin. Some of those teachers, shortly after their appointment to schools, have been examined with trained classed teachers, and answered better than these teachers. I have mentioned that in some of the printed reports of the Board.

26488. The Chairman.—Do you find that those who are trained in the convents are superior in numbers and pleasure to the children than other teachers?—Yes; I see when I enter one of these schools the more neatness and cleanliness, and the same good manners in the children, that I perceive in the convent schools.

26489. Do the teachers who have been trained in convent schools remain in the service of the Board as long as other teachers?—Yes.

26490. Mr. Sullivan.—Will you give a summary of the results of the examinations of some of those teachers?—I have mentioned some of the results already, and shall now state a few particulars of the convent monitors, whom I examine yearly, both by printed questions and orally. On referring to the Board's report for 1863, I find that at the oral examination I've answered thirty-one rounds of questions without missing a single question. I have here the results of the examination of the Dublin monitors for 1867, and I find the monitors from the convent schools answered 74 per cent of the questions at the written examination, and 76.3 at the oral examination, whereas the monitors from ordinary schools answered only 46.8 at the written examination, and 53.1 at the oral.

26491. When you were at the training department in MacDonagh-street, what class of lectures were given in connection with physical science?—I believe in several years Mr. McGauley did not deliver any lectures on physical science. In 1867, the last year I was there, Dr. Clarke delivered lectures on chemistry, geology, and some other of the physical sciences.

26492. Was it considered in your time that those subjects formed a part of the business of the professors?—Yes, there was a regular programme of subjects, which agreed with the programme drawn up in 1846. I have a copy of the latter before me, and I find the subjects included among others are, mechanics, hydrostatics, pneumatics, optics, heat, the steam engine, electricity, geology, physiology, and chemistry.

26493. With the exception then of Dr. Clarke's lectures, which came in to supplement those of the regular professors, there were in your time no lectures given on any of those subjects?—No, except that I myself gave instruction in mechanics, pneumatics, the steam engine, as well as in arithmetic, meteorology, geometry, algebra, and trigonometry.

26494. Had you at that time any collection of philosophical instruments?—Dr. Clarke had change of them, except some pieces of machinery, models of the mechanical powers, Atwood's machine, and other apparatus of that kind, which I had to illustrate the laws of falling bodies, &c.

26495. Was there any physical cabinet, properly so called, in the possession of the Board?—There was, it was in Dr. Clarke's possession at the time.

26496. Did it contain many instruments?—I cannot speak as to its extent.

26497. Was it ever contemplated to have a museum there?—I myself proposed to have a museum to illus-

trate the lesson books, and I proposed it should be called "The National School-book Museum." When a class of teachers was coming up to be trained, I recommended a circular letter to be sent to them, asking them to bring up with them specimens of rocks, ores, fossils, and minerals, from the quarries, railway cuttings, &c., in their various localities. My idea was that this should form the nucleus of a National School-book Museum.

26498. Was not a large room set apart for the purpose of a museum?—Yes, it was called the museum. That was the room in which I showed the teachers under my instruction how to teach arithmetic and other kindred subjects.

26499. They put up, if I recollect rightly, one small case of fossils, but I believe it never went beyond that?—I cannot speak of it since 1857, as I ceased to be connected with it at that time.

26500. What means have the professors of illustrating the different objects they speak of, either in the lectures, or in showing how to teach the subjects of the books?—I believe the instruction so far as that is concerned is merely verbal. The objects referred to in the books are not brought before the teachers to make them understand the lesson books.

26501. Who draws up the programme of questions for the annual examination of teachers?—Do you mean the examination of teachers held by the Inspectors?

26502. Yes?—Those are drawn up by the Head Inspectors.

26503. I find in those questions several on chemistry of rather a high class of questions; does not that programme that it forms a portion of the training at Marlborough-street?—Well, it assumes that they read a book on chemistry published by the Board.

26504. One or two of the questions I could not find in the Board's book. There was also a question on the classification of birds, which implied considerable knowledge of ornithology. Do they give special lessons on ornithology?—I am not aware that they give lessons on chemistry, ornithology, botany, electricity, or any of those subjects.

26505. Mr. Gibson.—Is not "Mr. Patterson's Book on Zoology" generally used by teachers in training?—Well, they have access to that book, but I never found it in use.

26506. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Is it a valuable book?—It is rather a fair book, but there are some technicalities which might be omitted, and would tend to make it more popular with the teachers.

26507. Mr. Gibson.—Are you not aware that at the Albert Training School, Glasgow, there is a museum?—They have a museum there, I believe. The agricultural pupils have some geological and botanical specimens to which they can refer.

26508. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you know anything of the last edition of the "Board's Book on Natural Philosophy," in three volumes? Is that exclusively used by teachers in your district?—That is the text book they refer to when preparing for examination.

26509. Are they strictly examined within the limits of that?—I cannot speak for the Inspectors generally.

26510. If a teacher were to answer outside that would the mark be against him?—If I were examining a teacher on any subject, and if he gave me an answer not contained in the book, and that I believed it to be a correct answer, I would take it.

26511. Are you aware the Board published a new edition of it three or four years ago without any alterations?—I believe it was first published in one volume, and afterwards they divided it into three;—that was the extent of the change. The three volumes taken together would make the original volume. There was another edition which preceded both, that included a summary of arithmetic, algebra, trigonometry, &c., which has been omitted in the later editions.

26512. Mr. Storer.—Do you see any reason to believe that the ordinary schools in Dublin have been left in their present miserable state of neglect with

Feb 22, 1900

Edward  
Sheehy, esq.

the view of driving children into the central schools in Marlborough-street under the exclusive control of the Commissioners?—I believe there is no such desire as that. I believe it arose from two or three causes. One cause is, the teachers in Dublin are not equal to the teachers in Cork and other places, as their salaries, compared with their expenses, are smaller than those of teachers in other parts of Ireland. Thus the system of training and classifying externs, who never had charge of schools before, and sending them to teach, has had a very bad effect on the schools in Dublin.

26513. Could you tell me how long the examination of monitorers lasts one day—say from ten o'clock till five, and the oral examination, in my own case, for I have had a large number of monitorers in Cork and Dublin, was spread over two or three days; and I made this arrangement with them, that those who lived in Cork or Dublin might go away after the written examination, and return on a certain day in the following week, while those who lived at a distance in the country were to remain and be examined next day, in order not to put the latter to any inconvenience. The written and oral examinations of the male monitorers lasted a day each.

26514. Is it the practice of the Inspectors to bring in young women from long distances, and keep them more than one day at some central point?—They are kept two days.

26515. Is it necessary to keep them away from home a night?—Well, I think so, to examine all together. Otherwise the Inspector would have to hold examinations at all schools in which those young people are taught. I think it is very necessary to have a written examination, and that would take a day each for the monitorers and monitorers. I think the oral examination ought to take at least one day for each, and in my district it takes three or four days for both.

26516. Did you ever happen to hear that in England the Inspector takes care to release pupil-teachers from examination at such an hour that they may reach their homes before dark?—I wish we could adopt that plan in Ireland, but I am afraid it could not be done here. In order to have a written and an oral examination, it is absolutely necessary to keep each at least two days.

26517. Would it not be possible to conduct the oral examination in these schools when you visit them?—It would not be practicable; and besides it has a healthy effect to have all of them brought together, and examined one with the other. In Cork, I used not only examine them, but give them an slip of paper the tabulated results of their oral examination, which had a very good effect on the monitorers, and the teachers of the schools from which they came. They carried these slips of paper to their schools, and the teachers saw that they were backward in geography, arithmetic, &c., as the case might be.

26518. Have you found no mischief in practice from keeping them from home at night?—No.

26519. Do the teachers of your schools commonly read newspapers?—Well, I cannot speak from having seen them reading newspapers, but I should say every teacher now reads the newspapers—they are so cheap.

26520. I wanted to ask a few questions about pupil-teachers in model schools. You said the attendance of children in model schools was composed chiefly of a better class than in the ordinary schools?—That is the case in the Cork Model school, which was denounced by the Catholic Bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Delany, who is a great supporter of the ordinary schools. The more the model school was denounced by him, the more Protestant pupils came in from other schools; and it was those pupils that gave the school a respectable appearance.

26521. Do you find the class of pupil-teachers influenced by the class of children attending school? If you have a school attended by middle class children, does it not follow that the pupil-teachers

who instruct these children must also belong to the middle class?—I have not found that to be my experience. In Cork the pupil-teachers were a much humbler class than the pupils that attended the schools. In West Dublin the children that attend the model school are of the humblest class, and the pupil-teachers are much the same.

26522. Did you find that these pupil-teachers from the humblest class were able to maintain their authority over the middle class children?—Yes, I had no complaints of it in Cork.

26523. Would you not say generally that, regarding the pupil-teachers as persons about to become teachers, it would be desirable to train them in schools resembling the schools which hereafter they would have to conduct as teachers?—I think it is very desirable that they should be trained in schools like those they would afterwards be appointed to.

26524. Would you not say this—that since model schools are attended chiefly by the better class of children, and since they have no local managers, and that in these two particulars they differ much from the ordinary schools, it would be better to bring up teachers in good ordinary schools rather than model schools?—The Cork school, I think, was an exceptional case. In the school I mentioned a while ago, the West Dublin Model school, and the Central Model school, when I was connected with it, the children were of the humblest class.

26525. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have you any experience of the model schools of the country?—None, except the three schools I have mentioned.

26526. Mr. Stoker.—As a general principle, would you not say it was better to bring up pupil-teachers in schools resembling the ordinary schools, where they would be employed?—Yes, I believe myself the training of pupils as teachers in ordinary schools like these they would get charge of is better than to train them in schools of a different character, as, amongst other effects, it would popularise our system very much.

26527. By retaining monitorers some time longer in the ordinary schools, do you not think you could get a class as numerous and well prepared as to be qualified to enter and to fill the training schools, thus to complete their education?—I believe I could train up persons in ordinary schools as monitorers quite competent to come to the training establishment in Dublin, and I have done it in the Cork schools.

26528. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—How long were you stationed in Cork?—Nine years, from 1838 to 1847.

26529. Previous to the establishment of the Carmichael schools, was there any school under Presbyterian management in Cork?—There was a school in Queen's-street in charge for a couple of months of a young person who came from the Queen's College. He had been four years in the Queen's College. I examined him and found him incompetent, but able and intelligent. I recommended him to be kept on trial.

26530. Was it under the National Board?—It was under the National Board, but the new schools established by Mr. Carmichael drove away the pupils from it.

26531. Was there any school under Presbyterian management in Cork previous to the Carmichael schools?—Not that I was aware of.

26532. Would you not agree that for many years there was a good school under Presbyterian management in Cork not connected with the Board?—I was not aware of it.

26533. Were not some persons connected with it as teachers who afterwards became Inspectors under the Board?—I heard that some of our Inspectors had been teaching school there, but I did not know it of my own knowledge.

26534. I presume you have inspected the St. Nicholas schools in Cork?—Yes, frequently.

26535. Under whose management are they?—The Rev. Dr. Webster's.

26536. Is he a minister of the Established Church?—Yes.



Feb. 20, 1868.

Edward  
Shawby, secy.

25337. Were his schools mixed?—I believe there were a few Roman Catholics attending there. I made a return on one occasion; there were a few Roman Catholics attending the school, and I think there were Presbyterians also, but the great majority were Established Church pupils.

25338. Were you therein in 1837?—I left in the end of February, 1837.

25339. Should you be surprised to learn that on the roll of these schools there were in 1837 568 of the Established Church, eighteen Roman Catholics, twelve Presbyterians and children of other denominations?—Yes, I am surprised to hear there were so many Roman Catholics.

25340. Mr. Sullivan.—How many would eighteen on the roll represent in attendance?—I suppose six or attendance. We have three numbers which form a kind of proportion—the total number on the roll of school for the year, the average number on the roll, and the average attendance—they bear the ratio of one, six, and three.

25341. Mr. Shawby.—Do you think there is any ground to be based upon names on the roll, as reference to attendance?—I can draw a conclusion as to the regularity, or irregularity of the attendance.

25342. Is it not possible for eighteen Roman Catholics to appear on the roll, if eighteen children attended the school on one day each?—Yes.

25343. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is that probable, or usual in your experience?—Well, I am inclined to think they would remain longer than a day.

25344. Are there any other mixed schools in Cork under the National Board?—In the Blackrock convent school some Protestant children used to attend, and at the time of religious instruction, even before the rules of the Board required it, the nuns used to send them into another room, away from the religious instruction.

25345. Do you know the schools of Spike Island and Haulbowline?—Yes.

25346. Are they good schools?—Spike Island schools are good, Haulbowline not—it is a very neat school, the writing is good, but the reading not, and the counting in geography, grammar, and arithmetic, is not at all equal to the writing.

25347. Did you find these schools mixed?—Yes, they were universally mixed, because the pupils were living on an island. They were the children of people employed on the island.

25348. Was the manager a Presbyterian in your time?—The managers very very much. I think the managers were the stockholders.

25349. Is your time was he a Presbyterian?—No, Mr. Fogarty and Mr. Eds, who were managers, were Protestants.

25350. Would you think this was a correct return for Haulbowline school—eleven Established Church children, forty-nine Roman Catholics, five Presbyterians, and one of another denomination?—I could not say.

25351. Mr. Sullivan.—That is a Government school?—Yes; each teacher gets a salary from the Government in addition to the salary he receives from the Board.

25352. No argument could be drawn as to mixed attendance from such a school?—No; the children could not go to any other school unless they crossed the ferry to Queenstown, Spike Island, Ring, or Willaple.

25353. The school at Spike Island is similarly circumstanced?—It is similarly circumstanced.

25354. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Do you find it an advantage to have children mixed in schools?—I think they could be mixed with advantage in small schools, and that they could learn their lessons just as well mixed together, Roman Catholics and Protestants, as if they were separated.

25355. Which do you approve of, mixed or denominational schools?—I would like to see them mixed, provided there were sufficient safeguards against proselytism.

25356. Have you ever known an instance of proselytism as the direct result of attending National schools?

—I do not know as to the direct result, but I believe cases have occurred.

25357. Can you specify a case?—I do not remember any case where a Roman Catholic went over to the Established Church or to the Presbyterian Church.

25358. Are not the rules of the Board a sufficient safeguard in your estimation?—I believe the rules of Board now, if they were strictly carried out, of obliging the children to leave during religious instruction, would protect them from proselytism.

25359. As a matter of fact can you testify that they are not carried out?—The day I visited the Balton-school, which are under the management of a Presbyterian deaconess.

25360. What is his name?—The Rev. Dr. Black. The Established Church children attending there were present at the catechetical instruction given by the Presbyterian teachers. I think the rules of the Board require those pupils to be excluded.

25361. Are you sure the rules of the Board do require their exclusion?—My interpretation of the rules of the Board is that they should be excluded, or that the parents should come and sign a certificate requesting the master to give them catechetical instruction.

25362. What would you say if the Commissioners of Education said that such was the interpretation of the rules?—I do not wish to give my opinion as regards the decisions of the Board.

25363. What was the catechetical instruction with which you found fault?—I reported that children of the Established Church were present in class with Presbyterian children, whilst the teachers, who are Presbyterians, examined the latter on the Westminster Catechism. They did not take part in the instruction, but they were present and heard it, and were not at any other business during the time of religious instruction.

25364. Did you hear from the Chiefs of Inspection or the Secretaries that such was contrary to the rules of the Board?—I spoke to Mr. Hunter, one of the Chiefs of Inspection, about it, and he thought the teacher was not obliged to put them out. I brought the matter subsequently under the notice of the Resident Commissioner, and he agreed with me that during creed teaching they ought to exclude the pupils of a different religious denomination.

25365. Is that creed teaching Presbyterian as distinct from Episcopalian?—If the Westminster Catechism be the recognised catechism of the Presbyterian Church, and if it be not the catechism used by the Established Church, I think the teaching of that catechism by a Presbyterian teacher, and under a Presbyterian manager, is creed teaching.

25366. What would you say if the word Presbyterian was not to be found in that catechism from beginning to end, and that it was compiled not by Presbyterians?—I have heard it stated that it was compiled by members of different churches.

25367. Rev. Mr. Covey.—Are you, as a Roman Catholic, prepared to settle the hosts between the Established Church and Presbyterian doctrine?—I am not.

25368. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—In that case are you prepared to say what is creed teaching as between the two Churches?—I am not prepared to distinguish between the two.

25369. Were you in the Board's service previous to 1854?—Yes, as Inspector.

25370. Did you report on convent schools previous to 1854?—Yes.

25371. Were your reports previous to 1854, unaltered in tone and tendency to those which have appeared since, as to results and the efficiency of the teachers?—My reports on the convent schools were of a favourable character.

25372. Do you regard female education in this country as improved hitherto or otherwise?—I believe female education has improved. I believe those who attend convent schools are greatly improved in their education.

Feb. 28, 1862

[Witness]  
Shank, esq.

26573. Do you concur in the statement made by another witness, that the improvement in the matter of female education is largely owing to the operation of the convent schools throughout all Ireland?—I concur in that.

[At this stage the scene was cleared, and on re-admission the examination was resumed as follows:—]

26574. You have been in the city of Cork?—Yes.

26575. How many convent schools are there?—Two, and two missionary schools in connexion with the Board.

26576. Then, if you please, to page 975 of the Census of Ireland, part 2, and give me from thence the proportions of females able to read and write in Cork in 1841 and 1851?—There were 38 per cent in 1841 and 45 per cent in 1851.

26577. How much was the increase?—Seven per cent.

26578. You are now Inspector in Dublin?—Yes.

26579. Would you tell me how many schools are in connexion with conventual establishments in Dublin?—There are two taught by nuns themselves, and two under the patronage of nuns, but conducted by lay teachers.

26580. Is not the education of females largely in the city of Dublin, as well as Cork, in the hands of the religious orders?—No, unless convent schools that are connected with the Board be taken into account.

26581. Rev. Mr. Currie.—Do you refer to the whole of Dublin as to the north of Dublin?—The north of Dublin only.

26582. Rev. Dr. Ffrench.—Tell me page 971 of the same volume, and give me the proportions of females able to read and write in Dublin?—The proportions were 59 per cent in 1841 and 60 per cent in 1851.

26583. What was the increase?—The increase was 10 per cent.

26584. If you found by the same census returns that in Belfast the increase was from thirty-six to forty-nine, or 15 per cent, where the education was not in the hands of the religious orders, and that in Carrickfergus, where there is no such establishment, the increase was from 54 to 55 per cent,—that is, 21 per cent,—would you still attribute the improvement in female education in Ireland to the operation of convent schools?—I speak of the improvement of female education in Ireland, so far as it came under my own observation, in those districts I have a personal knowledge of. In my special reports on the convent schools in the Cork district, I referred to the large number of pupils attending them in comparison with the number attending the ordinary National schools alongside them. At Milltown there was a much larger number in the convent school than in the two male schools adjoining. At Kinsale the case was the same. At Queensdown the numbers were about equal, but that was from want of accommodation in the convent school. Since then the convent school has been nearly doubled in size, and I believe its attendance is now much larger than that of the male schools.

26585. [Question repeated.] I repeat, the answer I gave a while ago. My answer referred to my own experience of the convent schools that came under my notice. I believe that female education has largely improved in those localities where the convent schools exist. I believe they attract a much greater number than ordinary female schools do.

26586. Will you not answer the question directly?—I could not answer it for all Ireland. I will answer it for the portion of Ireland that came under my inspection.

[Adjourned.]

# LETTERS REFERRED TO BY WITNESS, Question 26483, Page 1172.

Office of National Education,

10th January, 1862.

SIR,—We are to inform you that the following teachers have been announced to the next training class:—

James Duffy, Donnybrook-street.  
Michael Smyth, Donabate.  
Patrick Bellaw, Phibsboro'.  
James Fitzgarry, Raheny.  
Thomas O'Keefe, North Brunswick-street.  
Mary Browne, Drumcondra-road.  
Mary Quinn, Moortoy-street.

The female teachers are directed to present themselves on the 16th, and the male teachers on the 16th instant.  
You are requested to inform the teachers, without delay,

that they have been summoned, and that they are to present themselves on the days above specified.

We remain, sir, your obedient servants,

(Signed), JAMES KEAT, } Secretaries.  
Wm. H. NEWELL, }

Edward Shank, esq.,  
17, Moortoy-square, North.

(Circular.)

Education Office, January 16th, 1862.

SIR,—We have to inform you that there are a few vacancies remaining for male teachers in the training class, and we have to request that you will recommend suitable candidates from amongst the pupil-teachers of the model school in your charge.

We are, sir, your obedient servants,  
(Signed) JAMES KEAT, } Secretaries.  
Wm. H. NEWELL, }

To Inspector of National Schools.

SIXTY-NINTH DAY—DUBLIN, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1869.

PRESENT:

The Right Hon. the Earl of POUKE, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. the Earl of DESRAVENS, K.P.  
The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord  
Bishop of MEATH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACK  
The Right Hon. Mr Justice MORRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KANE, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BRIDGES, Esq., M.C.

Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.  
Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, D.D.  
JAMES ANTHONY DEANE, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q.C.  
SCOTT NANCYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., M.D.  
LAURENCE WALSHON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } *Secretaries.*  
D. B. DUNN, Esq., }

His Eminence Cardinal CHALKER SMITH and ASSISTANTS

Feb. 22, 1869

14587. The *Chairman*.—Does your Eminence desire to make any statement to the Commissioners in the first instance?—If your Lordship allow me I shall make a statement of the different views which I consider should be brought before you in this important inquiry; I shall state what my views are upon religious education and upon mixed education, and then as regard upon the National system as it exists in Ireland. These are the three leading points upon which I wish to lay my views before the Commissioners. As to religious education—all sincere and enlightened Christians are agreed that it is quite necessary. The words of our divine Lord—"What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul, or what exchange shall a man give for his soul?" (Mat. xvi. 26)—are quite sufficient to show the importance of a religious education. They show the importance of knowing what we are to believe, and what we are to do in order to secure the end for which we have been created. This end, the salvation of our immortal souls, is of such value that our divine Lord came down from heaven and died upon the cross in order to procure for us the means necessary for attaining it. We cannot attain this end unless we know what we are to believe, for faith is necessary, and unless we know what we are to do in order to please God, for works also are necessary. Thus in the Catholic doctrine, I refer to it merely to explain what we Catholics hold, and the conclusions to which our doctrine necessarily bring us.

The importance of religious training is a necessary consequence of the fall of man. Children come into this world without any knowledge, and quite helpless, and they remain so for many years, and unless they be properly instructed, they will not understand for what they have been created, nor will they know what course they ought to pursue in this world in order to attain that end.

Besides, men have passions and appetites, and inclinations which they must learn to control and moderate by restraint. Every one of us can say with the poet,—

"Vixit malum probaque deservit seque."

The necessity of religious training is also evinced by the quality of the doctrines we are bound to believe. On holy religion, teaches us the greatest mystery—mysteries connected with the existence and the eternity of God, with the Trinity of persons, with the redemption of mankind, and the immolation of our divine Lord, and with the sacraments. All these mysteries are far above our comprehension; and unless they be frequently inculcated and carefully explained, it is to be feared that, distracted by worldly cares and thinking only of what fills their senses, children will forget them, and live as if they did not believe them. Again, the Christian religion contains many precepts not easily observed, and which seem unwise and difficult to flesh and blood; if not inculcated on youth these precepts may afterwards be looked on as a heavy burden, and perhaps neglected. All Catholics are obliged to fast

and abstain, to go to confession from time to time, and to prepare for receiving the holy sacraments; they are obliged to submit to a great many other rules of the Church, and if not taught to practise and respect them at an early age, they will scarcely ever bring themselves to observe them when life is more advanced. "A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."—(Prov. xxi. 6.)

At the present time there is a great tendency to materialism, to the promotion of everything affecting the interests of this world, and there is a great neglect at the same time of everything supernatural, of everything relating to the world to come. This material tendency of the world can be combated only by an early religious education.

Finally, there are a great many bad books circulated at present against religion and morality, and unless the young be trained up to resist the temptations which are held forth in such works it will be impossible for them to get through the world in safety.

I have quoted a passage from a speech made at the late Church Congress in Dublin, by the Rev. Eschke Clarke, upon bad books, which confirms what I state. Having mentioned some reviews, he adds:—

"Below this class there is a more vicious range of fiction appealing especially to the young. In a recent article in the 'Rockefeller' the names of thirty-one of these criminal outpourings are given, and their weekly issue is calculated at a quarter of a million. These numbers consist of sensational tales of the worst kind, and the vilest of all are specially issued for boys. In them (as a writer in the *City Press*) robbery and murder are pictured every week, human suffering is pictured in every stage, and human depravity is so chronicled that the greatest sinners because the hero of the story page. Beside this filthy and polluted stream we have had the recent vile exhibition of selling the glass of slating woodwork to the garbage of the police courts, already sufficiently disgusting in the wood-pictures of the newspaper reports."—*Church Congress, Dublin*, p. 1468, 345.

The Rev. Ed. Whately, a Protestant rector in Dublin, says on the same occasion, in regard to Ireland:—

"My experience of the literature of the poor is, that the greater part of it—that which is most sold amongst the lower order—is of a spurious kind . . . which excites the passions violently, but does not appeal to the intellect more than is superficial romance. The quantity of this literature which is sold is almost beyond calculation. I have sometimes spoken to those who sell this class of immorality and low periodicals in my parish, and they have answered me by saying that if they did not keep such publications they would not be able to earn a livelihood at all in that locality. A great deal of the literature circulated among the poor is that which is calculated to induce the passions; but I think there are publications current amongst them now which are full of Atheism. Sometimes they even attempt to render the Scriptures subservient to their lawless purposes, and even to prove from the Bible that all men are equal." &c.—*Ibid.*, p. 323.

There are other symptoms of the tendency of the times we live in, observable on every side. A great many works have been recently published not only against the Catholic faith, but even against the leading truths of religion admitted by the generality of Chris-

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Chalk  
Smith

Feb 28, 1869

His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

times. I may refer to a work written by the Rev. Dr. Barlow, Fellow of Trinity College, against the eternity of the pains of hell, another work on the same subject by a Mr. Litton, and a history of modern Rationalism written by Mr. Lecky, a graduate of the same college, a work in which nearly all the chief doctrines of the Catholic Church are impugned with great art and great plausibility, and almost everything of a supernatural character in Christianity is assailed. Whilst so many writers impugne Divine truth, and endeavour to destroy it, I think we must come to the conclusion that an extensive and peaceful knowledge of religion ought to be imparted to children in school, in order to prepare them for the struggles of after life, and to preserve them from the attacks of infidelity to which they may be exposed.

Great writers, philosophers, and statesmen, from whom I have copied some passages, agree in all that has been stated.

"The great work of education," says Milton, "is to reprove the soul of our first parents by learning to know God aright, to love him, to desire to imitate him as best we may, pursuing our souls to true virtue, which being united to true science, makes up the highest attainable perfection."

Locke declares "that a literary without a virtuous education is rather an evil than a benefit."

Many speakers in the House of Commons have expressed themselves in the same way. I quote some of them remarks in order to show the value they attach to a religious education, and the conditions which, in their opinion, are necessary to make education truly religious.

Lord Standon, referring to a speech of Lord John Russell, says that he—

"We are glad to hear the doctrine that religion was an essential part of our first parents by learning to know God aright, to love him, to desire to imitate him as best we may, pursuing our souls to true virtue, which being united to true science, makes up the highest attainable perfection."

Lord Mahon (same debate, p. 1107-8) says—

"The second question was, whether they would have a system of secular education solely, or of secular and religious education combined? For his own part he considered that if the State should confine itself to secular education, without associating it with religion, it would be doing absolutely worse than nothing."

Lord John Russell (ib. p. 1231), refuting the project of Mr. Roebuck to separate religion from education, states—

"I do not think that the future minister, contemplated by Mr. Roebuck, is likely to have a very long tenure of power if 'vote for education without religion' should be placed on his banner, and that entirely secular schools should be established by the State."

Sir Robert Peel (ib. 1234)—

"I am for a religious education as opposed to a secular education. I do not think that a secular education would be acceptable to the people of this country. I believe, in the noble lord (John Russell) has said, that such an education is only half an education, but with the most important half neglected."

A great statesman of British origin, but belonging to another country—the founder of a great republic—Washington, in his Farewell Address to the American people, says—

"Of all dispositions and habits which lead to public prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. A virtuous people could not turn all their commerce with private and public liberty. Let it simply be asked—where is the society for property, for population, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the souls which are the instruments to create of justice? And let in such cases inculcate the proposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

When Napoleon the First undertook to re-establish religion in France, after it had been almost destroyed by the Republicans, he saw that he should commence

with the education of the people, and M. Portalis, acting for him as Minister of Public Instruction, addressed the Legislative Body in 1802, in these terms:

"There is no instruction without education, no proper education without morality and dogma. The professor, because it was universally proclaimed that we should more speak of religion in the schools, have taught in the desert."

"We must take religion as the base of education; and if we compare what the instruction of the present day is, with what it ought to be, we cannot help exclaiming the lot which awaits and threatens the present and future generations."

"Point d'instruction sans éducation, point d'éducation sans morale et sans religion. Les professeurs ont enseigné dans le desert, parce qu'on a proclamé imprudemment qu'il ne fallait jamais parler de religion dans les écoles. Il faut prendre la religion pour base de l'éducation. Si l'on compare ce qu'on a l'instruction avec ce qu'elle devrait être, on se peut écrier de douleur et de crainte que le sort qui menace les générations présentes et futures!"—*Discours au Corps Législatif*, 1802.

Gizot also, who was Minister of Public Instruction under Louis Philippe, a man well versed in educational matters, speaks in the same strain:

"In order," says he, "to make popular education truly good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious. I do not simply mean by this, that religious instruction should hold its place in popular education, and that the practices of religion should enter into it, for a nation is not religiously educated by such petty and mechanical details: it is necessary that a national education should be given and received in the midst of a religious atmosphere, and that religious impressions and religious observances should penetrate into all its parts."

"Religion is not a study or an exercise to be restricted to a certain place and a certain hour; it is a faith and a law, which ought to be felt everywhere, and which also this manner alone, can create all its beautiful influences upon our minds and our lives."—(*Gizot's Memoirs*, t. 3, p. 49, Paris, 1860.)

Resener, Prussian Minister of Public Instruction, in one of his circulars to the people of Rhine, says—

"I have heard that in many places, and especially in the towns, the teachers in the primary schools on Sundays and holidays are very irregular in their attendance at divine service, or do not attend at all. As the teachers are obliged to instruct their pupils in a knowledge of Christianity, the principal object of elementary instruction, and as they ought not only to instruct them, but to educate them in a Christian manner, and as in consequence they are bound to give good example to the children, you will agree with me that as grounds of complaint have been given by the teachers, it is necessary to adopt efficacious measures in the case," etc.

On the 1st October, 1851, he writes:—

"Within the last years it was imagined that the moral direction of the schools would undergo great changes. This idea ought not at present evoked any influence on the way of carrying out the inspection of the school, for the correction has become more and more founded, the prosperity of primary schools depends on its intimate union with the Church. The Government now feels called on to strengthen this bond as far as possible by discharging the existing legal prescriptions relative to the state inspection carried on by means of commissioned agents will be most fully enforced," etc.

The same Mr. Resener, in a speech on the same subject in the Chambers, 15th March, 1853, adds:—

"Let the young generations grow up in those principles (Socialist and Infidel) and without any belief in God, and you will soon have to reap bitter fruits."

Times we see that distinguished statesmen and politicians admit the necessity of uniting a religious with a secular education, and do not hesitate to proclaim that knowledge not hallowed by religion is rather a curse for the world than a blessing.

I shall now quote some few sentences from an eloquent French priest, Dupanloup, the Bishop of Orleans, who rather deserveth what a school ought to be than reasons upon the matter:—

"Yes; the presence of God, His sacred presence, I might almost say His personal presence, must be often recalled during the course of each day and on the night of the different phases and the inevitable difficulties of education."

God and His holy name, the thought of His power and His goodness must be frequently and lovingly brought in—*scripture, religion and moral education will be either evil or worthless.* "The child must be inspired with the love and the fear of God: with the love of God, that noble and pure feeling, so natural and so lively in a young heart, and so fitted to give it to great things." The love of God, and beside, the fear of God, set a fearful and awful firm, but the final fear, respectful and just wonder, of which Bousset, the tutor of the great Darwin, wrote: Let him by all means learn all the wisdom available to his position, and even all those that are in any way perfect the culture of his mind, adorn his life, and recommend him to the learned; but above all from his youngest youth, from his very cradle, let him first learn the fear of God, which is the best support of human life."

I shall add one more testimony—that of a very distinguished Irish bishop, Dr. Dwyer, who has been frequently referred to as favourable to the separation of secular from religious instruction, but who authoritatively teaches quite the contrary. In a letter to his clergy, written in 1837, he says:—

"In all these schools religion should be the first and last occupation of the child—to raise his pure heart to heaven, as in the first day assigned him by his Creator, so shall it be the groundwork of all the instruction he may receive. Religion shall not be banished when some dangerous infection from our schools. A child shall not be taught to lose the memory of the law of God, to commence with heaven by earth to decide some petulant inspector, and shall he pay to a lie. No! in our schools religion shall be the basis of education, and that religious instruction will embrace whatever else contributes to mould the heart to virtue, to subdue the passions, to regulate the affections, and prepare the mind for that world full of dangers, into which as a young school he is obliged to enter."

All these passages prove that religion ought to be made the basis of education. They prove also, I think very clearly that the persons who instruct children should be religious themselves; for if they do not believe, they cannot teach religious truth properly. They prove that the atmosphere of the school should be religious, and that every hour of the day religion should be inhaled, exercising its beneficial action upon the minds of the growing generation. That is all I wish to say upon the necessity of religion. It is a point upon which all are pretty well agreed, except reckless theorists, and those who reject revelation, or deny the existence of God, and the punishments and rewards of a future life.

25388. The Chairman.—In dealing practically with the question of education the great difficulty of Parliament has always been to reconcile the giving of religious instruction in the schools with keeping the schools and by the State open to persons of various denominations in such a manner that the children shall not be forced to receive religious instruction to which their parents object. In the English schools that difficulty has been endeavoured to be met by what is called the conscience clause. The position and habits of Ireland being considerably different from those of England, what analogous mode would your Honour suggest to carry out the object of Parliament in this country—I think, my lord, the first thing to be done would be to determine on what principle we should act. The principle already passed by a great weight of authority is, that religion should be the basis of education, and should be inculcated with every branch of instruction. We, Catholics, admit this principle, and as we believe that there is only one true religion, we look on it as a necessary condition of a good education, that Catholic children should be trained up in the Catholic faith. Any legislation excluding this sort of training will interfere with their right to a full religious education. But it is said that if Catholics enjoy this privilege, children of other religions will not be able to attend their schools with safety. If this be the case, the only consequence to be drawn from it is, that Protestants should have schools for themselves, and that a denominational system should be established, so that in their respective schools, Catholics and Protestants may give to children the fullest instruction in their own doctrine. There is no

just ground for enacting that all schools should be open to children of every class, and that nothing should be taught in them but what would be suitable to all the children of the kingdom. The rich must have schools for themselves, and learn many things not necessary for persons in a different state of life. It would be absurd to pretend that the schools destined for the higher classes should be conducted on the same plan as those erected for the poor. Candidates for a military life must receive a different education from those who are preparing for the bar or the medical profession. It is nothing wrong to teach in medical schools things useless for barristers or soldiers, and vice versa, although by this system some will be excluded from the advantages of the school. It is the same with regard to religion. Catholics, as a general rule, have a full right to teach their own doctrines in their schools, and to bring up their children to the principles and practices of Catholicity. Protestants wish to enjoy the same rights as Catholics ask for, or, rather, they have always enjoyed them. Nothing ought to be done, in a country like this, to deprive either Catholics or Protestants of those rights, and hence, the denominational system ought to be reintroduced. Thus being done, there would be no ground of complaint; every class would be in possession of the right of giving the fulness of religious education to its own children. There is no principle of law which requires that all children should frequent the same school or all have the very same sort of education. There will be always differences, and when those differences exist the way to prevent contentions and disputes is to let every class have its own schools.

25389. In those places where both Roman Catholics and Protestants—including in that phrase for the sake of convenience, members of the Church of England—are sufficiently numerous to maintain schools of their own, would your Honour prefer that there should be two schools, one under Roman Catholic and one under Protestant management?—I would prefer altogether that each class should have its own schools. There will be less contention; there will be more clarity maintained when a separate system is introduced. Here in Dublin, the Protestants have their own schools, and the Catholics have theirs. There is very little mixed education at all in Dublin, except in the model schools or the workhouses, and there are no angry disputes about religion. In Belfast, where the schools are mixed, there are continual religious discussions amongst the people. I think to bring children together still ignorant, but strongly attached to the religion of their parents, is only a means of exciting discussion. And then, if discussion does not spring up, there will be another evil—that children of every class will begin to think very little about their own religion. Catholics, if they are under Protestant masters whom they respect—if they are constantly with Protestant children as companions or playmates, will begin to think that one religion is as good as another, and that the religion of the master and of the other children is better than, or good as, their own. The same will happen to Protestants. Thus, a general system of indifference will be introduced, or a system of contentions and disputes.

25390. In towns and populous places do you consider the education and the allocation of schools should be rather according to congregations than to territorial divisions?—The old territorial or parochial system should not be abandoned, but of course the number of the respective classes must be taken into account. Sometimes one parish will require several schools, in other circumstances one school would be sufficient for two or more parishes. But the schools ought to be denominational.

25391. Can your Honour suggest how those cases should be dealt with in which either of the two great religious divisions is in so small a minority in a particular place that it cannot maintain an efficient school of its own, say a school of twenty-five or thirty?—Different plans might be provided for such a case as that. In the first place, I think the twenty-five children would not have a right to interfere with the system

70, 25, 1868.

His Honour  
Colonel  
Cotton.

Feb. 22, 1899  
 His Eminence  
 Cardinal  
 Cullen

of religious education to which four hundred or five hundred others have a claim. They would not have a right to say "You shall not get religious education in your school because we have no school of our own; if we go to yours, nothing must be taught in it contrary to our way of thinking." Their education should be provided for in some other way. Probably, persons of their own religion from other districts would be able to assist them. Perhaps the ministers of these respective congregations would be able to provide for them. If there were twenty-five or twenty-six Catholics in a town I would recommend the priest himself to instruct them rather than send them to schools of a different religion. Very small numbers cannot be provided for by general laws. According to an old maxim of the Roman law *de maximis non curat Princeps*. But if it be necessary to make a provision, the Purse system could be adopted. Under that system, where there is a large number of Catholics and a large number of Protestants, each class has its own school. In the case of small numbers they get up a mixed school subject to special regulations. No one is to interfere with the religion of another. A provision of that nature could be introduced here, but let the great mass of the people have denominational schools. This plan was proposed in a letter to Sir George Grey by the Irish bishops; they stated that there would be no difficulty in providing for minorities, such as those referred to in mixed schools, by a conscience clause. But where there are schools filled with Catholic children exclusively, let them be Catholic and let the Catholic religion be taught in them. Where there are some few Protestant schools let the Protestant religion be taught. If a measure be necessary let some special regulation be made to protect the religion of each class. But as all parties in Ireland are favourable to denominational education, there will be very few schools of this kind.

26592. Is the present constitution of the National Board satisfactory to the Roman Catholic body?—We object to mixed education, and to any body established for the purpose of carrying it out. But looking to the formation of the Board, constituted as it is of a body of independent gentlemen receiving no salaries, I think Catholics in general would have no objection to it on that ground, provided its functions were limited to impartial arrangements, literary matters, and a general right of inspection in those two departments. I would greatly prefer a Board consisting of a number of independent gentlemen to a paid Board. We have examples of paid Boards, and I think they do not enjoy the confidence of the people, and have not been very successful. But in regard to the Catholic Commissioners, gentlemen should be selected who would be real representatives of Catholic interests.

26593. Do you consider that the present Board, consisting of one paid Commissioner to attend to all the routine business of the office, with thirteen other Commissioners, who decide on points of importance, and act as a council, and represent various interests, a preferable constitution to that, for instance, of the Irish Poor Law Board, which is managed by two or three paid Commissioners?—I think the constitution of the National Board is better than that of the Poor Law Board, but I think the working of the National Board could be improved.

26594. In what manner?—In selecting persons who could generally attend. I would have independent gentlemen, but gentlemen who could be present to manage the business of the Board. I think it would be better without any paid Commissioners. Two paid secretaries, acting under the orders of the Board, would conduct matters better than one paid official of the same rank as the Commissioners. If there be a paid Commissioner he generally becomes the Board, and can act just as he wishes himself. If there were secretaries of an inferior rank to the members of the Board, they could be managed and kept in their proper place. The Commissioners would not then be able to throw the responsibility on any one person.

26595. Do you think it desirable to have persons

living in different parts of Ireland, so that the wants of different districts should be represented and made known?—There is no great difficulty now on account of the railroads, about then living in different parts—you can get to Dublin from the remotest part of Ireland in a few hours. The difficulty is to get gentlemen who will attend, manage matters themselves, and not take everything that is proposed in them on the word of the resident Commissioners, or of the Secretaries. If gentlemen do not examine business themselves, they ought not to be Commissioners.

26596. Do you think it desirable that any changes in the rules and regulations of the Board should be submitted to both houses of Parliament before they are put into operation, in the same way as is now done with the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education in England?—It would be very hard to get Acts of Parliament which could regulate all the little details of a vast administration such as that of the National Board, but the general principles might be sanctioned by law, and the Board should always act in conformity with those principles. The first principle I would lay down would be that all schools should be denominational. If that were once settled I think all things would go on very harmoniously.

26597. I am not suggesting that the rules of the Commissioners should be embodied in Acts of Parliament, but that before being put into operation they should lie for a month on the table of both houses so that any member might raise a discussion on any point to which he objected.—I would have the leading rules sanctioned by Parliament, and then leave to the Board itself the right of modifying them in minor matters. It is a very hard to tie the hands of an administrative body where there is an infinite variety of little things occurring every day.

26598. At the commencement of your consultation your Eminence said you wished to make a statement about mixed education. Perhaps this would be a convenient time for you to do so?—I was anxious, my lord, to make some observations about mixed education. It is, I think, a leading point to be considered by this Commission. I have collected a good deal of material upon the subject which will help to throw light on it. Mixed education, as now established in Ireland, consists in assembling children of different denominations together, putting them in the same way as under Catholic or Protestant masters, or under both, and excluding from the schools the teaching of any sort of doctrine which would be offensive to any of the children present. However, the teaching of what has been called common Christianity—that is, of those doctrines in which all Christians unite, has been introduced. But if the principle on which this system is founded were fully carried out, there would be very little religious training in the schools. In the schools fully mixed nothing should be taught clashing with the views of Christians, Socinians, Arians, Methodists, and Quakers; and I do not see why we should not add, of Jews, Hindus, and Mohammedans, or Moslems, some of whom find time to thrive among us. In this way religion would be almost completely banished from the schools, and children would be left without any proper education. The poor children for whom public education is introduced, generally depend upon the training they get in the schools. They have very few opportunities at home—their parents, living in miserable hovels—struggling with want, badly fed, badly clothed, generally engaged in hard labour from morning till night, can do little in the way of instructing them. If one poor child be not obliged to study religious matters in school they cannot learn them elsewhere. It is said the poorest way to instruct them on Sundays. But the children have not sufficient attention to derive much benefit from a long and continued discourse; and it is very difficult to keep them together for a sufficient time to give them full religious instruction, and to make a proper impression on them. Religion should be taught continually and not made the work of an hour.

The feeling in Ireland, I think, is altogether unfavourable to mixed education. All the rich and respectable

Feb. 24, 1859.

The Recorder  
General  
Cullen.

people send their children to mixed schools. The Protestants send their children to Protestant schools, and the Catholics send their children to Catholic schools, and pay very highly for them in order to have them properly educated according to their own religion. I don't know a single Catholic of respectable standing who sends his children to a Protestant school. I don't know any Protestant of the same class who sends his children to a Catholic school. So then evidently a decided feeling on the part of the better and educated classes against the mixed system. As to the poor they are quite anxious for denominational education. This is proved by the anxiety with which they run to any religious school that may be opened. If a school of Christian Brothers' be established in any place it is immediately filled with boys, who leave the National schools, or schools where religion is not taught, in order to get themselves properly trained in their own faith. There was a new school to be managed by the Christian Brothers opened the other day in North Brunswick-street, in the parish of St. Paul, and before ten days there were 340 boys in it. I think there are two or three establishments of the Christian Brothers' in the diocese of Dublin, and on last Wednesday one of the Brothers had the children attending there counted, and there were present 3,976 boys, representing more than 10,000 on the rolls, according to the system of accounting adopted by the National Board. What we have said of the Christian Brothers may be applied to nuns. If they open a school it is immediately filled with little girls, anxious to get a good Catholic education. At the last election several candidates for places in the House of Commons from different counties and boroughs, in order to secure the popular vote, declared themselves favourable to denominational education. I recollect that some years ago a paper was addressed by nineteen Catholic members to Mr. Cardwell, pointing out the evils of the mixed system, and calling for a change in it.

As to the Catholic clergy, it is scarcely necessary to say they have always been in favour of denominational education, though they have sometimes consented to mixed education as an experiment, and with the condition that the Catholic children should have the means of being fully instructed in their faith. In 1824 there was a petition presented to Parliament altogether favourable to leaving education upon religious. In that paper it was stated by the Catholic Bishops—

"That in the Roman Catholic Church the literary and religious instruction of youth are universally combined, and that a system of education which separates them can be unpropitious to the members of her communion; that the religious instruction of youth in Catholic schools is always conveyed by means of unsifted and unimpartial, daily given, and the reading of religious books wherein the Gospel morality is explained and inculcated; that Roman Catholics have ever considered the reading of the sacred Scriptures by children as an inadequate means of imparting to them religious instruction, as a sage who knew the Word of God is made liable to misverities, youth exposed to misimpressions, and thereby not infrequently to errors; it is only the impassioned which can, after much private ignorance to their own best interests, as well as to those of the society which they are destined to form. That schools whereof the minister professes a religion different from that of his pupils, or from which such religious instruction as the Catholic Church prescribes for youth, is excluded, or in which books and texts not sanctioned by it are read or commented on, cannot be resorted to by the children of Roman Catholics; and that diocesan and parochial have been found equally unavailing as a means of inducing Catholic parents to procure education for their children from such persons or in such schools; that any system of education incompatible with the discipline of the Catholic Church, or superintended exclusively by persons professing a religion different from that of the vast majority of the poor of Ireland, cannot possibly be acceptable to the latter, and must in its progress be slow and embarrassed, generating either distrust and discord as well as a want of that sacred good faith and perfect confidence, which should prevail between those who receive benefits and those who dispense them."

In 1826 a series of resolutions, which I hand to, was adopted by the same bishops, in which they tacitly upon an education fully Catholic, but at the same time consent to certain modifications in order to meet the views

of those who were anxious for a certain mixture of the different denominations in the schools.

"RESOLUTIONS OF THE CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND, ON EDUCATION, UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED WITH JANUARY, 1826."

"1. Having considered attentively a plan of National education which has been designed for us. Resolved, that the attendance of Protestants and Roman Catholics in the same schools, for the purpose of literary instruction, may, under existing circumstances, be allowed, provided without any to be taken to protect the religion of the Roman Catholic children, and to furnish them with adequate means of religious instruction."

"2. That in order to secure sufficient protection to the religion of Roman Catholic children, under such a system of education, we deem it necessary that the master of each school in which the majority of the pupils profess the Roman Catholic faith, be a Roman Catholic, and that in schools in which the Roman Catholic children form only a minority, a permanent Roman Catholic assistant be employed, and that such master and assistant be appointed upon the recommendation, or with the express approval of the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese in which they are to be employed; and, further, that they, or either of them, be removed upon the recommendation of such bishop. The same rule to be observed for the appointment or dismissal of managers and assistants in female schools."

"3. That we consider it improper that masters and managers intrusted for the religious instruction of Roman Catholic youth should be named or educated by or under the control of persons professing a different faith; and that we conceive it most desirable that a male and female model school shall be established in each province in Ireland, to be supported at the public expense, for the purpose of qualifying such masters and managers for the important duties which they shall be appointed to discharge."

"4. That in conformity with the principle of protecting the religion of Roman Catholic children, the books selected for their particular instruction in religion shall be selected or approved by the Roman Catholic prelates; and that no book or treatise containing instructions in doctrine shall be introduced into any school in which Roman Catholic children are educated, which book or treatise be objected to, on religious grounds, by the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese in which such school is established."

"5. That a transfer of the property in several schools which now exist, or may hereafter exist in Ireland, may be entirely impracticable, from the nature of the tenure by which they are, or shall hereafter be held, and from the wishes of persons having a legal interest in them, as well as from a variety of other causes; and that, in our opinion, any regulation which should suppose such transfer to be made, as a necessary condition for securing parliamentary support, would operate to the exclusion of many useful schools from all participation in the public bounty."

"6. That, appointed as we have been by Divine Providence to watch over and preserve the deposit of Catholic faith in Ireland, and responsible as we are to God for the souls of our flock, we will, in our respective dioceses, withhold our concurrence and support from any system of education which will not fully accord with the principles expressed in the foregoing resolutions."

25309. The Chairman.—May I ask was Dr. Doyle one of the bishops who drew up that document?—Certainly, and very probably he took a principal part in drawing it up.

We now come to the Synod of Thurles, in 1850, in which the principle of mixed education was again condemned. The following is from the pastoral of that Synod—

"As rulers of the Church of Christ, chief pastors of his flock, religiously responsible to the Prince of pastors for every soul committed to our charge, it follows, as it obviously, our first and permanent duty to strive to the greatest in which they hold—the doctrine with which they are associated. And surely if ever there was a period which called for the unceasing vigilance, the patient forethought, the untiring and self-sacrificing zeal of our august ministry—that period is the present. The alarming spectacle which the Christian world exhibits at the present day, the novel, but formidable means in which error pursues itself, and the manifold evils and perils by which the Church is encompassed, must be evident to the most superficial observer. It is no longer a single heresy, or an eccentric fanaticism—the dream of some secluded brain, or the excesses of some extravagant error, but a comprehensive, all-pervading, well-organized system of intellect, aimed to every capacity and reaching every intellect, that corrupts and dissolves the moral world. It is not such the calumnious speculations which the continent of Europe offers to us at this moment. Education, the source of all intel-

206. 22, 1860.  
 "The  
 His Eminence  
 Cardinal  
 Cullen

lectual life, by which the mind of man is nurtured and its affections, its principles determined, his feelings regulated, his judgments honed, his character formed, has been forcibly divorced from every connection with religion, and made the vehicle of that cold scepticism and heartless indifference which have corrupted and corrupted youth, and by a necessary consequence alien to its centre the whole fabric of social life separated from her heavenly moorings; leaving it no longer the organ of that wisdom which cometh from above, which, according to St. James is "chaste, peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, condescending to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, without judging, without dissimulation," but rather of that wisdom, which he describes as "earthly, sensual, and devilish" (James, c. 16, v. 15-17).

"It is, we feel assured, unnecessary to observe to you, that of all modes of propagating error, education is the most subtle and dangerous, for, adding to it does the almost by which the social body is sustained, which circulates through every vein, and reaches every member; and that if this almost should prove to be corrupt or delinquent, it will not fail to carry moral disease and death to the entire system. Hence, the awful obligation we are under at the peril of our souls, of watching over the education of the people whom God has entrusted to our charge.

"Let us to the emphatic words in which the present Viceroy Lord Russell forth the dangers to which youth is exposed at the present time, and the dangers which are placed upon the position of the people in this regard—"It is incumbent upon you," he says, "and upon ourselves, to labour with all diligence and energy, and with great firmness of purpose, and to be vigilant in every thing that regards schools, and the instruction and education of children and youths of both sexes. You will know that the modern theories of religion and human society, with a most diabolical spirit direct all their activities to pervert the minds and hearts of youth from their earliest years. Wherefore, they leave nothing untried, they strive from no attempt to withdraw schools, and every institution claimed for the education of youth from the authority of the Church and the vigilance of her holy pastors" (Earl's Letter of Privy IX, 18th December, 1849). Such are the words of the Viceroy of Jesus Christ, which show the responsibility under which we are placed, and point out our duty to protect from the insidious snares laid for their destruction, the bulwark of the faith—that most beloved but precious position of the flock of Jesus Christ, which the prophet represents as carried in his bosom.

In the year 1863 a general meeting of the bishops was held, at which resolutions were adopted strongly condemnatory of mixed education. They are as follows:—

"That schools for Catholic youth should be such as to serve for them the benefit of a solid moral education, and adequate religious instruction in the faith and practices of the Catholic Church. They should be, therefore, as subordinated to bishops in their respective dioceses, so that no books may be used in them for secular instruction to which the ordinary shall object; and that the teachers both as to appointment and removal, and the selection of all books for religious instruction, and the arrangements for it, be under the control of the same ordinary.

"That the principles contemplated can be adequately embodied and acted upon in this country only on a system of education exclusively for Catholics.

"That the Catholics of Ireland have a right to obtain such a proportion of the aid generally allocated by parliament for education, as, regard being had to their numbers, and the condition of the Catholic population, will suffice for the establishment and maintenance of schools to be conducted on thoroughly Catholic principles.

"That the concession of grants for exclusively Catholic schools in Great Britain and in the British Colonies, is a conclusive evidence of the fairness of the claim to a grant being made for Catholic schools in Ireland; and that the Catholic people of Ireland should therefore, insist through their representatives in parliament, and by direct application to the Government, on obtaining such a grant.

"That the National system of education, though intended on account of the partiality of education of the country, must be, as far as its nature, in several respects, objectionable to Catholics, and that the changes made in its rules from time to time, having been adverse to Catholic interests have increased the distrust of the Catholic episcopate.

"That we signify, as especially objectionable, (1st), the non-recognition of the control over education which the Catholic Church holds to have been conferred on bishops by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when He said to His Apostles: "Go, teach all nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19).

"2. The practical substitution, in its stead, of the control of a Board consisting of members of different religions

denominations, predominantly Protestant, and deriving its authority exclusively from the State, whilst its power extends to and is exercised in matters vitally affecting religion.

"3. The education of Catholic teachers in the model or normal schools, even in history and philosophy, and of children in other schools by Protestants.

"4. The constitution generally of the model and training schools and their establishment throughout the country in opposition, in many cases, to the declared opinions of the local bishops.

"5. The exclusion from the schools of the cross, and of all symbols of Catholic devotion.

"6. The character of several of the books published by the Commissioners, the use of which is enforced in the schools under their immediate management, and is practically unavailable in schools deriving aid from the Board.

"7. The rule adopted some years ago by the Board, according to which and has been since the adoption refused for the erection on earth of schools where the school estate be vested in the Board—a condition especially at variance with the instructions of the Holy See and the decision of the Catholic bishops of Ireland in the national and provincial synods.

"8. The inherent evil in the system that the schools are all liable to inspection by Protestant officers of the Board, and the fact that schools exclusively attended by Catholics, are, in fact, excluded exclusively under Protestant inspection.

"9. The fact that in schools deriving aid from the Board, Catholic children have received and may receive, religious instruction from Protestant teachers, in opposition to the original intention as laid down by Lord Stanley—the Commissioners not recognising the spiritual claims of Catholic pastors to be the guardians of the religion of Catholic youth in attendance on National schools."

It is useless to add that these resolutions contain a distinct declaration in favour of denominational education.

26500. The *Chambers*.—With respect to the point mentioned in the last sentence about Catholic children receiving instruction from Protestant teachers—that is touched upon in the heads you have been good enough to furnish the Commissioners with; you say, the principle laid down by Lord Stanley in the letter to the Duke of Leinster—and then, a system of mixed religious instruction, adopted in opposition to the instructions of Lord Stanley—would you have the goodness to explain the point in which you consider the present system is in opposition to the instructions of Lord Stanley?—I think, my lord, that in the progress of years important changes have been made in the rules of the Board. In the letter of Lord Stanley, given at page 2 of the first volume of the collection of the Education Reports, it is stated "That it was recommended by the House of Commons, that the system to be adopted should afford, if possible, a combined literary and a separate religious education, and should be capable of being so far adapted to the views of the religious possessions which divide Ireland, as to render it in truth a system of National education for every class of the community." Explaining the duties of the Commissioners, Lord Stanley maintains this distinction and says that they are to exercise full control over all books to be used, "whether as the common literary, or separate religious, instruction." Again he adds that "The most scrupulous care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils." Now, the system thus proposed has been abandoned. The National Board at present undertakes to give a combined literary, and moral, and religious education. The books for common use in each school, besides literary instruction, contain lessons in morality, lessons in Scripture, and religious treatises, all to be explained by the teachers. Hence, if the master be a Protestant, he can teach things opposed to the Catholic religion. If he be a Catholic he may explain things in a sense hostile to Protestantism. In this way an opening has been made for proselytism, and the original instructions of Lord Stanley have been set aside.

26501. Would you desire that the rule should be made absolute that no Roman Catholic should receive religious instruction from a person of another persuasion, and that no person of another religious persuasion should receive religious instruction in the schools from a Roman Catholic?—If you have the



Feb. 22, 1948  
His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

schools common and the books prescribed for general use in them replace with scriptural and religious matters, you cannot prevent a Protestant master, when explaining these books, from giving Protestant religious instruction to Catholic children, or a Catholic master from giving religious instruction, according to his own principles, if he wishes, to Protestant children. As this cannot be prevented if the schools be united, the only remedy is to have denominational schools; this being done each child will be safe, because he will be in the hands of a master of his own religious persuasion. At present many children, receive with danger to their faith, religious instruction from teachers of persuasions different from their own. In the report of the Board, signed by the Commissioners, for the year 1860, it is mentioned that there are 50,184 Roman Catholic children attending schools under Protestants, and that 1,816 of these attend Scriptural classes under Protestant teachers.

26602. Do I understand you consider it is impossible that the secular instruction in the schools under the Board can be communicated by a master of a religious persuasion different from that of the pupils, without conveying some religious impression on the minds of the pupils?—Taking the question abstractly, it is possible that a master might teach the children of a religion different from his own, without interfering with their tenets, but in practice this interference generally takes place even where it is not intended. If the Protestant teacher be a respectable man, if he be looked up to, and esteemed by the children, they will persuade themselves that everything he holds is right. Seeing that he does not go to mass on Sunday, a child will say "Why should I go to mass, when the master does not go?" Hearing that he does not go to confession or fast, another will say, "Why should I be compelled to go to confession, why should I fast when the master—who is so good a man disregards such things?" The same will happen to Protestant children in regard to a Catholic master. Hence I think it is practically impossible that a teacher of one religion can instruct the children of another religion without producing an effect upon them.

26603. Are you aware that in England where the system is to a considerable extent denominational, the Privy Council require that at least half the total cost of each school should be paid by the manager?—A portion at all events—I don't know the precise amount. But I may venture to say that the financial arrangements of England cannot be suited to Ireland, where we are very much poorer than they are in the sister country; and where the poor Catholics have to build schools and churches, and support their clergy, and bear many burdens from which England is exempt.

26604. Should you in Ireland be prepared to pay that price for the denominational system?—I think the people in many parts of Ireland are not able to pay anything for education, but where they are able to pay, I would be very glad to see them pay something.

26605. In the paper you were good enough to send us, you say that the model schools tend to throw the education of the country into the hands of the Government—are you aware that in England there is no training institution which is exclusively supported by the State?—I have heard that training institutions are established in England on the same principle as we get up reformatories here. The reformatories are founded by private individuals and managed by them, but the Government pays the expenses of the boys who are kept in them. I believe the same system is applied to the teachers in England—the school must be kept up by the Church to which the pupils belong, but then the candidates preparing to be masters or mistresses in training in the schools, are supported by the State. That appears to be the English system, and I would be very well satisfied with a similar system for Ireland.

26606. Do you think it would be a satisfactory change of the present system, if the Roman Catholics of Ireland were allowed to establish training schools of their own, similar to those in England, so the establish-

ments at Hammersmith and Liverpool, partially aided by the State?—I think it would be very desirable that such a thing should be done. I think the people here would be very thankful for any measure of that nature. As far as the female teachers are concerned, there would be no difficulty whatsoever in the matter because there are several convents which already train a good many girls as school mistresses.

26607. That would of course involve a similar liberty being given to voluntary associations of other religious bodies?—Oh, certainly. I would not interfere with them at all, provided they did not interfere with us. I would always say—if you do not interfere with me, I will not interfere with you.

26608. Would it diminish your objections to the central training schools in Mullough-street, if the Roman Catholic teachers in training were housed in houses, under Roman Catholic supervision, by themselves?—That would diminish some of the evils of the system, but it would not remedy everything. Pupils of different religious denominations would meet together in the same classes, they would be under teachers professing religious opinions different from their own, and their religion would still be exposed in this way to great danger, and bad impressions might be made either by the company or the teaching of the place.

26609. Would such a modification be sufficient to take off the veto which in some districts is imposed on teachers trained in Mullough-street?—Nothing will satisfy the Catholic body now but denominational model and training schools. They see what has been done in England, and they cannot understand why we should not have denominational training and other schools, which have in that country been productive of such good results.

26610. What is your view of the scheme that was sketched out by Mr. Christopher Fortescue's letter two years ago?—There were some good things in it, I believe, but I do not recollect it very well at present, as I have not read it lately. As far as I remember, he proposed that in connection with the training schools there should be separate boarding-houses for Catholics and for Protestants, but that all under training should meet in the same classes; that there should be a Protestant chaplain for the Protestants, and a Catholic chaplain for the Catholics. This part of the project would not be satisfactory, it retains all the evils of the mixed system; every thing would tend to make the pupils believe that one religion is as good as another, and thus religious indifference would be encouraged. The plan comprised another proposal something like that mentioned just a moment ago, viz., that any private person should have a right to establish a model school supposing he could provide sufficient accommodation for twenty pupils in training, and that there should be a National school attached to the house with an attendance of sixty or eighty children. This would be a measure of great importance and utility if carried out. A National school with sixty or eighty, or one hundred children frequenting it, could easily be established, and a house capable of accommodating twenty pupils in training could be opened, provided the means were supplied by Government to support it. This part of Mr. Fortescue's project would supply the country with good teachers; but unless the National schools attached to the training school were denominational, it would not be satisfactory.

26611. What is your objection to the agricultural schools?—I think they are generally useless and very expensive. This is my objection as far as I know them. I heard a very distinguished member of Parliament say they were called "model schools" merely because they were models to be avoided; I believe that is the general opinion throughout the country. But I do not refer to the Albert Institution at Glasnevin.

26612. Your objections are of a practical character, and you do not place that claim of school under the religious question?—We object to them because they cost a great deal of money, and still more because they are accompanied with all the evils of mixed schools. We object to them on religious as well as on econo-

Feb. 24, 1869.  
The Honorable  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

school grounds. No one imagines that they contribute to the progress of agriculture in the country, in proportion to the amount expended on them.

20613. Do you think the small school forms— from one to five acres—attached to some of the ordinary National schools are useful?—I believe, if the master had for his own garden as much land as they could cultivate without interfering with their school occupations, it would be useful. A place to live in, and a small garden annexed would contribute to the comfort of the teachers. They generally suffer on account of the difficulty of finding a proper residence near the school.

20614. Do you think it would improve the condition of the teachers if residence were more generally attached to the schools?—I think it would be of great service. The masters and mistresses often live a long way from the school. It would be very desirable to free them from this inconvenience.

20615. Do you think the present remuneration of the teachers is sufficient?—I have always heard it is not at all sufficient for their proper support. Some of them may starve too much, but they should get enough to enable them to live according to their state. I believe many of them get only £84, with which it is impossible to support themselves.

20616. Should you object if any improvement were made in the condition of the teachers to a portion of the income being made to arise from the number of pupils they would pass at proper examinations, according to what in England is called "payment by results"?—I think it would be very useful to examine what results were obtained by the school. It would be an inducement to the master and to the manager to see that proper attention was paid to study. However, in many parts of Ireland, where the country is very poor, it would be difficult for the master to keep a sufficient number of children to obtain good results. Hence exceptions should be made, but in the greater part of the country payment by results would be very useful.

20617. Do you think that in Ireland as much is given from local sources as can best be given to the schools?—In many cases, perhaps, if a little effort were made more would be given. However, a great deal has been contributed to undertakings necessary for the public welfare in Ireland, which ought to be taken into account. Your lordship will recollect that thirty or forty years ago there were very few respectable churches in Ireland. All our churches have been built very lately. There were no schools at the beginning of this century; since that time great surpluses have been built by the power of the people. The Catholic clergy are supported by the offerings of the people. Many convents and colleges have been erected in the same way. If the people have not contributed very largely to the payment of the schoolmasters, this is principally due to their poverty, and to the many demands for necessary works of charity made on them.

20618. Do you think it would be desirable in order to make all classes contribute fairly towards education that a portion of the expense of the schools should be raised by a local rate?—I don't know what the operation of these local rates would be. We often hear complaints of the oppressive character and mismanagement of local rates, which appear to be thrown upon those who are least able to bear them. It appears that the poor rate is very unequally levied over the country; the rich places scarcely pay anything, while the poor villages and towns are crushed with the amount of the rate. The same might happen in regard to school rates; perhaps the poorer places would pay most, and the richer places least.

20619. Do you think it desirable there should be practically one uniform system of books throughout the schools of Ireland, or would you leave managers free to select their own books, subject to the approbation, in the first instance, of the Board?—I think this question of the books is of very great importance. If the books contain good matter, well treated, they will be of great advantage to children, not only

in their school days, but in the course of their after lives. Persons that will not read any thing else will peruse the books which they mastered in school and derive great profit from them. My opinion would be that in order to promote the publication of good books and to secure a variety of them, the fullest liberty should be given to every manager of a school to select his own books. To prevent abuses let the Board have authority to exclude everything treasonable, illegal, and contrary to law, and let the ecclesiastical authorities look to the religious part of the books. The books of the National Board, though not made obligatory, are forced in reality upon the people; because this country is obliged to pay for preparing and printing them. Probably £200,000 or £300,000 have been expended in printing, in free gifts of books, or in selling them at reduced rates. This way of setting free the National books on the country, and preventing the compilation and sale of other books. No writer, however competent, would think of undergoing the expense of compiling and incurring the expense of printing class-books, when he sees that he has to contend against a monopoly supported at the public expense. To obviate this evil the selection of books ought to be free. There would then be some encouragement for authors to write, and good books would appear from time to time; for the past the anti-national monopoly enjoyed by the National Board has put an end to all competition, and served to crush the talent of the country. I have called the monopoly anti-national, because it tells in favour of strangers; the compiler of the principal books were the Rev. Mr. Coffin, Dr. Whately, and others, strangers to Ireland. Irishmen were scarcely allowed to write anything more important than a elementary treatise on arithmetic. No Catholic was employed, except in compiling the Third Book—all the others were Protestants. The value of the books, notwithstanding this exclusion of Irishmen and selection of strangers, is very testing, and many will agree with me in saying—that if all the books printed by the National Board were sent to the middle of the Atlantic and cast out into the ocean, Ireland and her literature would suffer no great loss.

20620. Is there any other point on which your Eminence would wish to say anything?—With your lordship's permission I will resume my observations on mixed education. I mentioned the resolutions of the Irish bishops in 1859. Similar resolutions were adopted in 1863 and in 1867.

"Resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Irish Bishops, held on the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd October, 1867, on Mixed Education.

"1. The assembled Bishops hereby re-affirm the resolution in reference to education adopted in a general meeting, held by the Bishops of Ireland in Dublin, on the 4th and following days of August, 1863, which are as follows:—

"(a) That the Bishops of Ireland, assembled in obedience to the instructions of the Sovereign Pontiff, and having first attention particularly directed, by his authority, to the National system of education, reiterate their condemnation of the principle on which that system is based—namely, the principle of mixed education, as intrinsically un sound, and as such in practice, as at variance with the interests of the Catholic religion and dangerous to the faith of their flocks.

"(b) They object to the enforcement on the Catholic people of Ireland of a system in which religion is constantly separated from secular instruction, in which the State would substitute its own power for the authority of the Catholic Church in respect to the education of Catholic youth and by ignoring the pastoral rights of the Catholic clergy, would deprive education of the only adequate security for its religious safety which the Catholic Church can acknowledge.

"(c) That so change in the constitution of the body charged with the administration of a mixed system of education can compensate for its inherent defects, or neutralise its injurious action.

"(d) That the constitution of the model and training schools, as has been repeatedly declared by the Bishops of Ireland, entirely conflicts with the principles of the Catholic Church, that we again condemn them as unchristian and dangerous; that we again hereby warn our flocks against them; and we exhort on our priests to use their best exertions to with-

draw children from them, and at the same time to endeavour, to the utmost of their ability, to provide equally good secular education for the youth of their respective parishes; and that we require a practical assurance of the resolution adopted at the last general meeting of Irish bishops—a copy of which we here submit, viz.:

"That, commenced at the appearance of Catholic teachers being invited only in Catholic model schools, we direct that, in the future, after the first day of next term, no such person be appointed as a teacher, either in the normal or model school, or in any other model school, or in any other school, with other patrons of National schools in working, after that date, teachers can be so trained, and that no teachers who shall be sent to be trained after that date to any model school, shall be employed as such by any priest, or with his sanction."

"(c) That we have learned, with the greatest satisfaction, and in the discussion in which model schools were introduced, a spirit against the authority of the respective bishops; the measures taken to prevent the attendance of Catholic children at them have been most successful; that we commend those zealous bishops on that score, and on the fidelity of their clergy and people."

"(f) That the failure of a general attendance of Catholics and Protestants at certain National schools has been so thoroughly exposed to a parliamentary report, so to render it quite easy for the Government to accede to the legitimate claims of Catholics for the reconstruction of those frequented by Catholic children. Those claims are—that the teachers in Catholic schools, approved of by the bishops and priests, are really concerned, that school-books, such as those compiled by the Christian Brothers, or like them, in Catholic bias and spirit, be used in those schools; that the use of religious instruction in the schools, and the arrangement for religious instruction be not interfered with, and that those schools be inspected only by Catholic inspectors, appointed as in England."

"(g) That as it is expedient to have teachers trained to teach, and as such training, being part of a well-regulated system of education, is acknowledged to be purely chargeable on the public educational funds, an adequate portion of that public money is due to the Catholic people of Ireland for the training of Catholic teachers, for Catholic schools receive aid from the State; and, that, as Catholic teachers cannot associate with safety in the existing training schools, a separate establishment for Catholics, approved of by competent ecclesiastical authority, is necessary; and should be provided at the public expense, or Catholic teachers should be trained and supported at the public expense in suitable Catholic institutions approved of by the bishops."

"(h) That, as it is forbidden by the bishops to send Catholic teachers to the existing training schools, and as it is the duty of Catholic parents, in obedience to the instructions of their pastors, to withdraw their children from existing model schools, Catholic Commissioners fall in with the request and demand made by ecclesiastical authority, if they require Catholic schoolmasters, or induce Catholic pupils to join training or education in those schools."

"(i) That we declare it to be the duty of the Catholic Commissioners of National Education to use their utmost endeavours to effect such a fundamental alteration in the system as will allow and be granted for schools exclusively and solely Catholic, as to teachers, books and other religious documents; and that failing to effect such change they ought to withdraw from a position in which they can neither do good or prevent mischief."

"(j) That we caution our priests against accepting building grants, under such conditions as are contained in those which the National Board has lately prepared, and against consenting to the acceptance of grants on those conditions in others."

"2. The bishops call particular attention to the resolution [which] declares that the constitution of the model and training schools is entirely at variance with the principles of the Catholic Church, and which require on parents to use their best endeavours to withdraw children from them, as being specially dangerous. They direct that that resolution be promulgated in all parishes from which it may be apprehended that children would go to those schools, and that priests be again requested that it is their imperative duty to enforce it to the utmost of their power."

"3. They also direct that the resolution of the bishops assembled in May, 1862, regarding the training of teachers, and of which, in their meeting of August, 1864, the bishops required a practical observance, be again notified to all Catholic managers of National schools." (See above, p. 43.)

"4. The meeting decides that a petition to the next Parliament praying for such a change in the existing National system of education, as may afford to the Catholics of Ireland all the advantages to which they are entitled."

To complete the account of episcopal proceedings, in

reference to education, I must mention a letter addressed by the Irish bishops on the 25th of November, 1863, to Lord Cardale, in which they ask for the denominational system. Then we have a letter written in reply to that document on the 26th of November, 1863, by Mr. Cardwell. Again, there is a long letter written by the bishops of Ireland on the 18th of March, 1864, to Mr. Cardwell, in which ample reasons are assigned to prove the necessity of establishing the denominational system in Ireland. It would be useful to insert these documents in connexion with the present evidence. At a later date, a letter was written addressed to Sir George Grey, in which the bishops again explain their reasons for wishing for the denominational system. This second letter refers to that class of mixed schools, about which your lordship questioned me a while ago. They say that in some instances, when no religious denomination would be able to supply by itself numbers sufficient for a school, mixed schools might be established as an exception to the general rule. The passage is at page 6 of the copy before me.

This letter was referred by Sir George Grey to the National Board, to be examined by the Commissioners, who were requested to state to him what answer they wished to be given to it. Though the letter was signed by all the bishops of Ireland, with one exception, the Board refused to give any answer, or to take into consideration the complaints of the bishops. They say they continue to believe that the policy they have hitherto pursued is as wise and sound as it has been successful. They beg to be referred from the necessity of departure from it by making the observations on the memorial of the Roman Catholic prelates which the letter of Sir George Grey writes them to offer. This letter, published by order of Parliament, was far from giving an exalted idea of the consistency of the Commissioners, for they had often entered into explanations with ministers of the Established Church, and Presbyterians, and the manifestations of their firm resolve not to enter into any discussion with the Catholic prelates who represent a great proportion of the people of Ireland, was not calculated to render the National Board popular in the country, and to remove its influence.

But to return from this digression, I think it is quite clear from the authorities produced, that the feeling of Ireland is in favour of denominational education. Those who are in high rank, the middle classes, and the poor, always prefer it to the mixed system. Notwithstanding all the efforts employed to advance it, the mixed system has made no great progress in Ireland. There are at present 4,567 schools, of which the patrons are all Catholics, 4,819 of which the teachers are all Catholics, 3,569 schools in which the pupils are all Catholics, and 2,084 schools in which the majority consisting either of Protestants or Catholics does not exceed nine on the roll, or about three in attendance. All this proves that the people are not attached to the mixed system of education. About six millions of money have been expended in promoting it—free grants of books and other school requisites have been liberally made,—and every possible concession has been given to the system, and still the schools are not raised to any great extent.

26224. You wish it that the primary schools, except in those exceptional places to which you have referred, should become denominational?—Yes, my lord, denominational wherever they can be, and recognised as denominational where all the children are of the same religion. Let the Catholics have their own schools; let the Protestants have their own schools, and that can be done in almost every part of Ireland. If there be any particular locality where such a thing cannot be done, let there be other provision made adapted to the place, but let not the general good of the country be interfered with because there are a few children in certain localities not sufficient to form a denominational school for themselves.

26225. The Earl of Dunraven.—The question of the constitution of the Board having been touched on just now, I am anxious to ask your Eminence if you

Fy 22, 1869.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb 22, 1869.  
 The Honourable  
 Cardinal  
 Cullen

have any more remarks to make upon it?—If I had the arrangement of educational matters, the first thing I would look to would be, what character the system of education was to take. Was it to be denominational or mixed? If it were to be mixed, I would say that it cannot be carried out in this country; whatever arrangements you make will not render it satisfactory to the people. But if it be agreed to adopt the denominational system, it will be easy to render it acceptable to all. Gentlemen will then be found willing to engage in managing it, who are conscientiously opposed to the mixed system. Catholic bishops and priests in Ireland as elsewhere, have very great influence with their flocks. Their concurrence and assistance in carrying out an educational plan would be always of great value. But as long as the system is mixed, they cannot cordially co-operate in managing it. Influential lay Catholic gentlemen agreeing with their bishops, feel that they ought not to take any part in extending mixed education through the country. To remove all conscientious objections, and to enable all to take part in the work of education, the denominational system ought to be established. That being done, I would not object to a mixed Board, formed of Protestants, Catholics, and others. Let there be Catholic bishops—let there be Protestant bishops—let there be Presbyterian ministers, if you wish, because all these have influence with their respective bodies, and let the board be properly constituted of persons who will attend to the business of the education of the country. If that were once done I think there would be no difficulty in carrying out and extending national and religious education. There would be no difference about the books, every class would have its own, there would be no difficulty with the teaching schools, because they would be denominational, you would have no religious jealousy about the ordinary schools, for they would be under their own respective bodies.

26623. I think I understood your Eminence to say that whether any modification of the present system was carried out, or the denominational system adopted—that in either case you preferred the principle of the constitution of the present Board, to that of a paid Board?—I think paid Boards do not succeed in Ireland, or have not succeeded up to the present. If you have a more paid Board, it will be looked upon as a body acting under Government, and representing the views of the Government, and the people do not wish the Government should interfere in educational matters, any more than in the religious matters of the country.

26624. In your opinion would not a paid Board place the education of the country more under the control of the State than a representative Board?—In my opinion such would be the effect of having a paid Board, and I do not think it desirable that either the education or the religion of the country should be at all under the control of the State. Religion, without doubt, would be looked on as a more state regime, if there were a paid Board to manage it.

26625. Is your Eminence aware of any country where the denominational system is carried out under a representative Board analogous to the National Board?—In France. It is carried on in the same way I think in Prussia. In France's schools, bishops, and priests, and the principal ecclesiastical authorities of the Jews, Huguenots, and Lutherans are unpaid members of the council of education, where they represent their respective bodies, and protect their interests. However, though the council of education is thus mixed, the schools are commonly denominational. The schools corresponding to the population are, in general, purely Catholic, but the Lutherans and Calvinists have schools for themselves in proportion to their numbers. Mixed education exists only in very few instances.

26626. Your Eminence stated just now that you thought the National Board might be improved by its consisting of persons who could attend more regularly than the present members. Is your Eminence aware how many members of the present Board regularly attend?—

I am not aware, but I have heard it repeatedly stated that they do not attend very regularly. I do not know how many attend. I have heard it repeatedly stated that the Resident Commissioner and the Secretaries do a great deal of the business without consulting the Board.

26627. We had it stated in evidence to us by the Resident Commissioner that the number who usually attend at the Board meetings is about ten and out of these several are in the habit of constantly attending, that these members, some of the most eminent on the Board, are consequently fully acquainted with the practical working of the system?—I saw a parliamentary return a few years ago giving the attendance of the different members of the Board, and I do not think the number of those who regularly attended was anything like ten. There were some members who did not attend at all.

26628. Was not that return before the last change in the constitution of the Board?—I believe it was. As the Commissioners are now more numerous, a larger number may be present at the Board without giving the meet of better attendance to each member. However, I cannot speak with certainty on the matter, but from what is generally reported, some Commissioners scarcely ever attend, and others very seldom, whilst others are said to take little interest in the business of the day when they are present.

26629. Is your Eminence aware that this is actually the practice of members of the present Board?—I cannot make a charge against any one. I do not know it of my own knowledge. I merely state what is reported.

26630. The Chairman.—Would it now be convenient to your Eminence to conclude your statement on mixed education?—If your lordship please I should be happy to do so. I have endeavoured to prove that the feeling prevailing in Ireland amongst the people and the clergy, is strongly in favour of denominational education. Let us now look to other countries, in order that we may learn from their experience and their wisdom what sort of education is best suited for the people. Beginning with England, we find that denominational education is recognised by law. From the Revised Code of 1868 containing the regulations of the Committee of the Privy Council on education, it appears that every school aided by the State, must be either a school in connexion with some recognised religious denomination, or a school in which, in cases with secular instruction, the Scriptures are read daily from the Authorized Version. So that all the schools are required to have a religious character. Even in the appointment of Inspectors, the Committee of Council consults the religious bodies which are mentioned in Article 30 before making representations to Her Majesty for the appointment of Inspectors to visit schools in connexion with those several bodies. In the trust deeds also, the rights of Catholic priests and bishops are guaranteed, and the authority of the bishop over the priest is provided for by declaring that any priest who is suspended from his office cannot act as trustee or manager of a school whilst under censure.

In the report of the Royal Commissioners presented to Parliament in 1861, we find the following testimony to the feeling in England in favour of denominational education:—

"We think that the existing plan (the denominational one) is the only one by which it would be possible to secure the religious character of popular education. It is unnecessary for us to enter upon proof of the assertion that it is desirable in itself. It is enough for our purpose to say that there is strong evidence that it is the deliberate opinion of the great majority of persons in this country (England) that it is desirable. Some evidence has already been given upon this subject of the feelings of the parents of the children to be educated. Those of the nation at large are proved by the fact that, with hardly an exception, every endorsement for the purposes of education, from the university down to the smallest village school, has been sanctioned by its founder with some religious body.

"The controversies which have occurred in the course of the last twenty years, the difficulties which they have thrown

Feb. 27, 1860.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

is the way of the establishment of any comprehensive (i.e., mixed or mixed) system, and their practical result in the establishment of the denominational teaching colleges and elementary schools, appear to be so plain beyond all doubt to the commonsense, that the great body of the population are determined that religious and education must be closely connected, and we do not think that any other principle than that which is the basis of the present system would secure this result."—(Report, p. 310.)

The Commissioners, then, adopt principles quite opposed to the mixed system, as appears from the following extract:—

"It has been supposed that the object of securing the religious character of education might be equally attained either by restricting the teaching given in the schools to points upon which different denominations agree, or by drawing a broad line between the religious and secular instruction, and by providing that the religious instruction should be given at particular hours, and by the ministers of different denominations. We do not think that either of these expedients would be suitable to the state of feeling in this country."

The plan (rooted in the same Commissioners) of drawing a line between religious and secular instruction, and confining the religious instruction to particular hours, would, we believe, be equally suitable to succeed. The principal promoters of education maintain that such a line cannot be drawn, and that every subject which is not merely mechanical, such as writing and working, &c., but if connected with the feelings and conduct of mankind, may and ought to be made the occasion of giving religious instruction. They maintain that the religious influence of the school depends so far upon the personal character and example of the teacher, upon the manner in which he administers discipline, upon the various opportunities which he takes for enforcing religious truth, and so the agent in which he treats his pupils, and teaches them to treat each other, than upon the distinctive religious teaching."—(Ibid.)

The Commissioners express very much what we feel, in general, in Ireland. If this Royal Commission were to draw up a report in the same sense, I am sure it would be greatly applauded by the bulk of the people of Ireland.

If we now turn to other countries we shall find that the same feeling which manifests itself in England, with regard to mixed education, prevails in France. Under Louis Philippe, attempts were made to spread mixed education in that kingdom, and there were great outcries about it a little before his fall. After the last revolution in 1830, a mixed Board, consisting of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, was appointed to carry out the system of education in the country. Though the Board was mixed, its business was to encourage separate unmixed or denominational schools. This appears from an extract from a letter of the learned Bishop of Amas, Monsigneur De Parisis, then Bishop of Langres. Defending the proposed Council of Education, then actively assailed by others, he explains his views in a work entitled "Verité sur le *Loi de l'Enseignement*," pp. 9-10. His words are:—

"If even the mixture (of persons of different religions) in the schools appointed to provide over education, were to have the effect of multiplying mixed schools, that is, schools in which children of different religions are received, it would be as evil. For the instruction given in these schools either ceases to be useful, if it is explicit for each form of worship, or it leads to indifference if it omits all that is connected with special forms of beliefs or creeds."

"But this law, far from favouring this sort of schools, and we beg particular attention to this point, this law is the first within the last sixty years that enables them and encourages to diminish their number."

"We admit and proclaim that these mixed schools have been one of the causes of the waning of the faith. We shall not even conceal our surprise that so few reclamations have been published against them. But we do not see how at this occasion a law may be attacked, which the first of all suppresses these mixed schools altogether. In principle, as contrary to the general good order; in interests then immediately, in fact, in far as possible (Art. 24, sec. 4), and which for other since decides that they shall not exist any longer except by a special tolerance of the Academic Council, a tolerance which can only be provisional."—(Art. 25, sec. 3.)

"The councils established by law, will be so far from promoting any alteration in the purity of the doctrines destined for teaching, or any increase of the fatal system of

mixed schools, that we think they must lead to a contrary result."

"They will, in the first place, inevitably produce a greater number of special schools for each form of worship, because the representatives of these forms will be present to ask for them, and it is the interest of each of them to have such schools; and secondly, what is more important, they will ensure much more than heretofore, the purity of religious doctrines."—(Op. Cit. p. 10.)

Writing upon the same subject, the Bishop of Viviers makes the following observations in a pastoral letter published in 1850:—

"It has become my duty to point out to you a rock on which this faith so precious may suffer a most dangerous shipwreck. The rock I allude to is that indifference in matters of religion which is practised in public, and as it were, in an official manner, in certain educational establishments. In these houses history and Catholicity have without hesitation been placed in presence of each other; there is a temple for one, and altars for the other; one portion of the youth is obliged to receive instruction in the true faith, the other as historical teaching. What disastrous impressions must not be produced on the yet scarcely awakened reason of the Catholic youth by this even-handed favour, or rather by this indifference with which each mode the most opposite have been treated? What value will be attached to the dogmas and practices of his worship, when he will know that under the same roof and same protection, those dogmas and these practices are represented to some of his fellow-students as so many superstitions? What idea will be formed of the faith of his co-religionists when he will see them obliged by their position to maintain a sort of neutrality between two religions, one of which possesses 'the truth' as not with one is against me? Will it not seem to this youth that his masters have set themselves apart from or rather above all questions of religion? Will he not be persuaded, that if they possess any personal religion, it is only as a matter of pure faith, an external appearance, that has to hold on their mind or on their heart?"

Other bishops have written in the same sense, and since freedom of education was introduced under the President of the Republic, denominational and religious schools have spread through the whole empire, and are increasing every day. The report of the Minister of Public Education in France, published in 1847, states that in 1836, the number of children in schools under religious—namely Christian Brothers—was 2,037,264. It adds that the religious establishments in 1831 were 18,836; in 1835 they were 20,302, and in 1836 the number was 21,030. So they had increased in five years from 18,836 to 21,030—nearly 3,000 new establishments. The report also states that the number of lay establishments in 1831 was 52,444; in 1835, 52,769, and in 1836, 53,310. So the lay establishments had not increased so rapidly in proportion as the others, and the average number of children in them was much smaller—being only 35. In the religious institutions the average was 97. As we learn from the statistics just given, that more than two millions of children frequent schools directed by Christian Brothers or nuns, we may conclude that a great feeling exists in France in favour of unmixed education. As to the schools conducted by the laity, they are very much under religious control, for the bishop of each diocese is a member of the Board which provides over education in his department, and the parish priest occupies a similar rank in his own parish. Thus we see that France does not differ from England or from Ireland in its estimate of mixed education.

In Prussia, about the years 1836-37-38, some thirty years ago, there were great disputes about education. Attempts were made to interfere, in the Rhenish provinces especially, with the education of the Catholics. But as great excitement in the country was the consequence, the Government gave way, and established the present system which is based upon religion. I have been a letter from the Archbishop of Posen, in Prussian Poland, in which he explains this system.

"Grazes, 16th December, 1853.

"Your Reverence, The mixed system has never been applied in Prussia to elementary schools, these have been and are at the present day purely denominational. The revolutionary party as well outside as inside Parliament, has been at work for many years, seeking to introduce the

Feb. 22, 1869.  
His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen

mixed system into these schools, but so far it has met with a determined opposition from His Majesty's Government. The new Bill on elementary instruction presented this year to the Chambers in Berlin by the Minister of Public Instruction, maintains the denominational character of these schools; as yet it is uncertain whether it will meet with the sanction of Parliament precisely on account of the opposition of the revolutionary party to this system.

"Thus what I have said you will understand that our elementary schools of Catholics have Catholic books and Catholic teachers, if Protestant, their books and teachers are Protestant. The normal schools for the training of teachers have, of course, denominational character; those for training Catholic teachers have Catholic professors and Catholic text-books, whilst everything in Protestant in the training of Protestant teachers. The rights of the bishops and pastors are recognized by our Government in regard to the schools of their respective sects, and are exercised in harmony with the rights which are claimed by the State. It is true that these rights are somewhat limited, and in particular a collision has occurred, but on the principal points such as the inspection and direction of the schools and the approval of the text-books as to their religious bearing our rights are secure.

"Our difficulties in regard to the elementary schools arise from other sources. Whilst instruction is compulsory, and every village must have its school. Wherever the majority of the population is Protestant, the school is Protestant, and if the Catholics are not in a condition, as often happens, to open at their own expense and maintain a school for themselves, their children must frequent the Protestant school without, however, assisting at the religious instructions of the Protestant teachers.

"In the higher schools the principle of mixed schools is permitted. The Government does not promote or promote it, but as we believe in religious freedom it depends on the Government, whether, to decide whether the normal schools, the gymnasiums, and the universities shall be denominational or mixed, but then the Government ordinarily declines to interfere with the desires of the provincial authorities or city councils, &c. Hence, whenever Protestant influence prevails the decision is unfavorable to Catholics. Even those mixed schools, however, allow positive religious instruction from Catholic teachers, and there is always one special teacher for the Catholic religion, who is paid out of the funds of the foundation, and who is appointed by the Government with the approval and sanction of the Bishops.

"I send to your Excellency a memorial which I addressed in my own name to the Minister of Public Instruction, and which was presented to the King. In consequence of that memorial a new Catholic gymnasium was granted to me for my two dioceses, and in a short time it will be opened.

"Munich, Aug.

"Archbishop of Cologne and Bonn

"Bonn, 12th December, 1866."

There happens that in Prussia the denominational system is established, and is working very well.

This is confirmed by a speech made by Mr. Gregory in the House of Commons, on the 15th May, 1866, containing some very good observations, which I shall read:—

"These efforts to obtain complete religious freedom have been crowned with success. The system at first met with opposition. Now it is the subject of universal pride and satisfaction. The Roman Catholic clergy of Prussia are stronger even than in Ireland. Those books which Archbishop Murray approved of, would not be tolerated there. The greatest jealousy is evinced at any attempt being made to reduce the teaching of a child on any subject connected with religion, to any but a minister or a member of it. No religious instruction, however small and unimportant, would be permitted to be supplied by a minister of a different faith, and this feeling animates both Bishops and Roman Catholics. Now, as to teachers, it will be seen that in Prussia the normal schools, which have supplied with instruction in Ireland, are of a very different character. There are in Prussia normal or training colleges, besides, then for or six in each province, established especially for the training of teachers. The young men purporting to be new schoolmasters, after passing through the primary and upper public schools, enter the normal colleges at thirteen and remain there two or three years. Having gone through several examinations by the masters of the school and the Public Board of Examiners, they get their diploma, which enables them to accept the situation of teacher. This education is all but gratuitous, the cost being defrayed by the State. Some of the normal colleges are for Protestants, some for Roman Catholics; but, with all are under civil regulations so far as to training proficiency goes, the books are

generally catholicistic, it having been admitted that these institutions should have a religious character. The result of this system is that an admirable education pervades the whole community, only two out of 100 not being able to read, write, and cipher, and a thorough and cordial acceptance of it by every religious denomination."

This extract shows how well the denominational system works in Prussia, and how satisfactory it is to every class of the people. We may add that Mr. Gregory's statements are derived from Dr. Engel, Director of the Statistical Department of the Minister of Public Worship and Instruction at Berlin, and are impressed with official authority. (See "Hansard," 14th May, 1866, p. 1025.)

In Austria the denominational system also prevails. The Catholics are the great mass of the people, and they have their own schools. In an address, published in 1849, all the bishops expressed their feelings in the following words, which show what they think in regard to the religious character of education:—

"At the present day there are none," say these Prelates, "who pretend to separate with violence the body from the soul, heaven from earth, education from the Church, the little ones from Jesus Christ. With words full of blasphemy they cry out, we will not allow the little ones to come to Jesus Christ—we forbid it. Such is the answer which they give to the tender invitation of God-made Man. Consider now by what authority should your Bishops be guided in these circumstances, if they do not wish to oppose their souls with the will-force of eternal damnation, with which Jesus Christ threatens those who suppose the little ones free coming to Him.—(Hansard, Nov. 6.)"

The following extract from the *Times*, of the 13th September, 1859, shows how the Protestant schools were managed:—

"The Protestants are for the future to be under the direction and inspection of their ecclesiastical organs.

"No books can be used in Protestant schools which have not been approved by the general conference (Protestant) and by the ministry for ecclesiastical affairs.

"If a Protestant school is established at the expense of the State, only Protestant teachers can be employed in it."

So that every advantage was given to the Protestant schools. They were made denominational, and Protestants had the same rights in them as the Catholics had in their schools. Perhaps the late revolution may have brought about some changes in this system which prevailed since 1839.

In Belgium the same liberty of education prevails as in Prussia and Austria. Lately, some attempts have been made to establish mixed schools, but they are opposed by the bishops and clergy. They are not in unison with the general feeling of the country—which is Catholic, and in favour of religious education just as we are in Ireland. I have a letter in my hand of the Bishop of Liège, written last September, with regard to a mixed school which some benevolent ladies were about establishing in Liège. They wished to establish it partly much on the principle of our National system, viz., that nothing about religion should be taught it except the principles of common Christianity. The bishop shows that such an attempt is contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and the feeling of the Catholic people of Belgium. His letter contains many good observations, which it will be perhaps interesting to read. Addressing the ladies, he says:—

"The undertaking projected by you, judged according to your own programme, cannot be reconciled with the profession of the Catholic faith; it would place you in opposition to the Church of God, of which you say that you are and intend to remain, members. You must not deceive yourselves on this point—as a father charged with the care of his family, as a shepherd responsible for the souls of his flock, I warn you against the false and fatal path, to enter on which you are pushed by influences which you are too credulous to distrust as you ought.

"Examine more closely what your programme sets forth. You undertake to teach in your school, or to cause to be taught there at your expense, the true faith, history, and civility;—you bind yourselves to place truth and error on a footing of perfect equality, you promise to welcome in your schools with equal favour all that God, the Sovereign

Truth, has revealed and commanded us to believe, and all that the Spirit of God has substituted in place of the word, and institutions of God; you wish, as the Scripture says, to serve two masters, between whom there is an irreconcilable opposition, and in your schools to glorify at once Christ and Belial! But Jesus Christ will never tolerate this divided allegiance; you know in what language he rejects and rebukes it.

Can it be possible that you have come to the determination of closing the doors of your schools against the influence of religion, which is the very soul of education; to exclude from the study of history the traces of God's providential action on the world, without which history becomes a barren and dry catalogue of events, and dates, and things, instead of being a source of useful practical lessons; to cut no woad of the great and beneficent part that the Church of God has played in the world for the last sixteen centuries; to withdraw literature from that spirit of religion which has inspired so many artists and literary men; to deprive the moral law of the support it should have in doctrinal teaching; and to weaken the sense of duty, by leaving the conscience from the emotion which faith awakens, and which is the only one that can effectually curb the passions of man? Can it be possible that, forgetting what you owe to your mother, the Catholic Church—yet full of tenderness for Protestants and Jews, and infidels, you would abjure from placing in your school-rooms the crucifix, the sacred figure of that Saviour to whom women owe all her happiness as daughter, as spouse, and as mother, and that you would hesitate to place before your pupils the chaste and tender image of Mary, the mother of God, the ever virgin, the model of female virtue in every age, in every rank of society, in every condition of life? Would you deprive your pupils of the silent but penetrating influences which, issuing from these two sources, would teach them that truthful lesson which awakens all the duty of woman, the spirit of devotedness, and of virtuous sacrifice of self? Would you close against those that look from which they may learn attachment to their duty, strength in their struggles, restoration in their bodily pains, patience in their domestic trials, fortitude in their disappointments, and the noblest idea of dignity of their being, and of the precious value of their souls?

As you told me that you are and wish to remain Catholics, I explained to you how unlawful it was to all directly to teach doctrines contrary to the Catholic faith. To teach this, say, as grave in the eyes of God and His Church, you now have recourse to a plan, which is strange even to Catholics. Since, without violating God's law you cannot teach heresy and infidelity, you refuse to teach Catholic truth. This is the vengeance you would take for the prohibition laid upon you by God against teaching error. You announce that your teachers will carefully abstain from all religious discussion. What is the true meaning that lurks under the ingenious vagueness of this phrase? It means that you forbid your teachers to employ religious influence in the training of their pupils; it means that religion, and especially the Catholic religion, is to be excluded from your schools, as necessary is excluded from them. I admit your programme declares that the teachers will carefully train their pupils to cherish their moral and religious duties. But do you not know that for a Catholic, there is no religious duty which does not depend upon a dogma for its beginning and its end. Have you not observed that it is a more common to think that we can make religious duties to be demanded, unless we explain their origin, their nature, their conditions, their necessity, and then sanction, that is, unless we enter upon the domain of theology, and go to the very heart of Catholic teaching? And the same holds good of moral obligation. Upon what will you rest your respect for moral obligation? What support will you assign to it, if positive doctrinal teaching be no longer its basis and foundation? Without positive doctrine and teaching, how will you strengthen for good the frailty of the human heart? What barriers will you oppose to its insatiable greed for pleasure and self-gratification? What consolation, what hope will you offer to the repentant?

This letter of the Bishop of Liège, besides explaining so well the arguments that militate against mixed education, shows what the feelings of the clergy and people of Belgium are on that subject.

In Holland a system has been introduced similar to that which prevails here in Ireland. It is described in a recent letter of the Very Rev. Dr. Lombert Van de Wijk, Professor in the Seminary of Heerengracht (Bakke), Holland.—

"I will say before you all that is necessary to give you an idea of the state of education in our country.

"I think there is no country in the whole world where so much is said about education as in ours. The public is now

divided into two camps, the one that of State education and neutral schools, the other that of denominational schools and private teaching. In the political world, the Liberals, who are generally Unitarian, with revolutionary tendencies, defend the present education laws, and the Ministers now in power belong to that party; while the Conservatives (that is the orthodox Protestants and many Catholics), demand a revision of these laws. The entire Catholic press and the bishops join in this demand, and call for a change in the law.

"The year 1857 brought in a new law on primary education, the year 1861 a new law on middle-class education (industrial schools and colleges) and now we are threatened with a new law on higher education (Latin schools and universities).

"The draft of all these laws is to withdraw the schools from all influence of the Church, and to render them neutral as far as religion is concerned. The third section of the law of 1857 on primary education runs thus:—

"The teaching of the school, while it confines on the children the benefits of useful knowledge, will also be directed to develop their mental faculties, and to train them to all Christian and moral virtues.

"The teacher is to abstain from teaching, doing or permitting to be done anything that could shock the religious feelings of those who differ in religion.

"Religious instruction is to be left attention to the ecclesiastical authorities. The school-rooms may be used for this purpose during the hours when there is no school."

"You see from this that the clergy both Protestant and Catholic, are bitterly drawn from the school, and that the religious element is excluded by law. The teacher is not allowed to speak of religion, but he should give offence to some one or other of his scholars, among whom he will generally find Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; and yet, at the same time, he is required to train them in the Christian virtues (even the Jews!)" Thus he can really do, for the Christianity in question may be described in the words of the commentator Scherboke, the author of the law, as 'a common Christianity, free from positive dogmas, and superior to all divisions in belief.'

For some time after the introduction of this law, no ill effects were noticed. Things went on much as before, especially where there was no mixed population. In our provinces the teachers are good Catholics and well disposed towards the clergy. But in districts the teachers will be come what the Government state or induce them—men of some talent who in order not to offend anybody will have no religion at all, and, indeed, even already we have a large number of atheists and rationalists in the teaching body, particularly among those of the middle schools. All that the Government requires from candidates for a teachership is a diploma of qualification given when a successful examination before a board of examiners appointed by the Government, and a certificate of good conduct from the burgomaster of the place he resides in. Once in possession of these documents, whether he be atheist, pagan, or Christian, he can offer to teach with impunity at all the districts of our holy religion, and in very often happens that as the ignorance of the children has no weight with the judge, he is acquitted at once should any charge be brought against him.

"Those who for conscientious or other reasons are unwilling to send their children to the public school, are at liberty to send them to private ones." This is the most answer given to the complaints made to the Government on the subject of the non-religious character of the schools. As a matter of fact, any individual who has his diploma may open a school where he pleases. Hence, the Catholic and dissenting communities can choose their own schools and direct as well the teaching to be given in them. Of course they must pay the teacher, and build the schools, whilst the other officers they must pay taxes for the support of the government schools. They are not in the position of our Irish Catholics who have to support an Anglican Establishment which they avoid, at the same time that they have to support their own private Catholic clergy. You will easily understand that in small villages and elsewhere there are but few persons who decline to send their children to the government schools, it is impossible to erect private schools. The Government gives no aid whatever to these private schools, whilst it pays generously, and even with prodigality the masters of the public schools, and sends freely any contributions from the churches.

"Notwithstanding all this, the land is stocked with private schools, both Catholic and orthodox-Protestant. These orthodox-Protestants (who are the followers of the famous Groot Van Praetere), unite with the Catholics in a determined opposition to the education laws."

The bishops of Holland assembled last August published a letter in which they explain their views.

Feb. 22, 1866

The Editors  
of the  
Cathol.

Feb 22, 1863.

His Excellence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

and declare themselves very strongly in favour of de-moralisation and against mixed education. This is an extract from their letter:—

"The Provincial Council of Ulster, held at Ballynagone, in 1855, commands 'that the people should not be allowed to grow up in ignorance, nor yet be left without the necessary religious teaching.' This command conveys what the Church feels about ignorance, education, and moral culture; but, as the text words imply, she has also another end in view, and to the attainment of this end all education should be shaped and directed. The same chapter of the acts of the Council then insists on this point:—'The Church has at all times shown a special solicitude about primary schools, which, indeed, she was the first to create, and which she has ever considered and designed to be the means by which the young are to be taught the elements of knowledge and be trained to virtue.'

"Free virtue, true morality, must needs come from the Church, and by the Church be fostered and developed, and the Church has never recognised in this matter any other office than that which, in the knowledge of things merely secular, and of the laws and usage of society, rather religious instruction, and assigns to the latter the first place. In those schools where the children of all classes meet, religious instruction, to use the words of Pius IX., 'should so permeate and so direct all the other branches of education, that, in comparison with it, they should be looked on as mere accessories.' In consequence of this principle, the same glorious Pontiff has condemned the proposition that 'Catholicism can approve of a system of education which is outside the Catholic faith and the authority of the Church, and which aims, or at least chiefly aims, at imparting a knowledge of things merely secular, and of social life on this earth.'

"This necessary influence of education seems to be better appreciated by the leaders of the infidelity that take this step, so exclusively absorbed in material pursuits, than by certain names Catholics. These leaders, who, in the Provincial Council expressed it, 'are well aware to what extent the true Christian spirit of society depends upon the religious education of the young, upon no point to substitute for that education, another governed by their own perceptions. Their aim is no want to any one; and as far as our own society is concerned, it is openly avowed in their speeches and writings. We find some, whose position gives weight to their words, and who set themselves to point out to the teacher how, without fear of blame or trouble, he may be enabled, with tact and persistence, to inculcate into the minds of his pupils modern principles, even when they are in opposition with certain religious precepts, such as held in the supernatural. Others, again, they in establishing a system of education calculated to efface gradually the deep and lasting religious convictions that send society; and, naturally enough, the means to this end is none other than the suppression of the religious convictions themselves. Others openly aver that education ought to give the discipline to all religious prejudices, and substitute in their stead a more healthy notion of the universe, and of mankind; and as a means of bettering on the people a true religious education, too long denied to them, they propose a radical infidelity, which will not allow all the particular forms of religious as of Christian. Such is the language held by persons in authority, who receive sympathy and support from many others in books, pamphlets, and writings of all kinds.

"A school which should thus really deserve the confidence of Catholics, must not only respect the Catholic religion by not interfering with it, it must also teach that religion, and assign to it the place of honour. In such a school, what is called social instruction must be united as closely, as possible with religious instruction; and this latter must pervade the whole training, and make the influence of religion be felt everywhere. Its lessons are to permeate throughout; the text books should, in modest measure, speak of the great truths of faith, of Christian morals, and of the Christian virtues; the teacher, too, should know how to introduce these lessons in their fitting places, and mingle them with all his teaching. In a word, in such a school, education does not consist merely in increasing the first elements of certain sciences, use in teaching the young to civic values, and social accomplishments; such has in making them polite persons, whose single aim is their personal gratification, whose sole motive is selfishness. No, education, properly so called, is a powerful help to parents, and those who have charge of souls, towards forming the young Christian, who as child of God, son of the Catholic Church, and heir to heaven, must be taught to think and act as a Christian, and to practice Christian virtues in the manner that becomes a Christian. The Christian virtues, not in the narrow sense attached by some to these words, but the true Christian virtues founded on faith in the spirit of authority, of charity,

of gratitude, of hope, and of fear, supported by the means which religion assigns as useful and necessary. These are what a good teacher will endeavour to inculcate in his pupils, and what he will lead them to practise. Of course, in a religious matter of such importance, the ecclesiastical authority must intervene, and in turn it will confer honour upon the school by presenting additional counsel, light and help for the teacher. This, and no other than this, is the idea the Church has formed of education; and this is the idea she wishes her children to entertain concerning it. Whoever thinks differently from this, and persists in it, is in direct opposition to the sense of the Council pronounced by Pius IX., in the Syllabus against the 45th, 47th, and 48th propositions.

"The Catholic child must necessarily receive a Catholic education.

"The Catholic school is one of the most ordinary means to that end.

"Even with the use of all the educational help applied by religion, we shall not always succeed in making the boy what he ought to be; so deep is the abyss of corruption in the heart of man.

"In an affair of such importance we are bound to employ the means which are most certain to be successful. The beloved brethren, are the principles which your bishops laid in their duty to impose upon you. May their words, which have ever been the words of men in whose name they address you, produce a deep and lasting impression on your hearts, especially in the exceptional circumstances of the present time. Your spirit, so sincerely Catholic, and which has given us such consolation in our painful ministry will show itself once again in the all-important matter of Catholic education. We are confident that whatever the clergy will undertake to do in obedience to their bishops in each parish towards the creation, support, and extension of Catholic schools, as well as whatever your bishops shall judge to be our duty as shepherds of your souls, will be favourably received by you."

To the words of the Catholic bishops of Holland in which they so emphatically condemn mixed or godless education, we shall add an extract from a speech of Mr. Gregory, M.P., already referred to in regard to Prussia, in which he points out the evil consequences that are derived from that system of instruction:—

"Education in Holland is not compulsory, it is mixed and purely secular, no religious instruction whatever is required, this exclusion of religious instruction dates only from 1852. Before that it was attempted to give combined secular and religious instruction, it having been inspired on those points on which both Churches, Roman Catholics and Protestants, were supposed to agree, notwithstanding only when they in opposite directions oppose 'This failed, as well it might, to give satisfaction to either side.' Those who favoured the present system think that bringing together children of all creeds establishes a friendly feeling and dissolves religious differences. The same arguments which are used in Ireland, namely, the large number of attendance at the schools is introduced as a proof of the popularity of the system. These are the opinions of the few. On the other hand, the great majority and the almost unanimous feeling of the millions of both religions is opposed to the present system, and the great number of children attending private, or, as they are called, 'Christian schools,' is introduced as a proof of their dislike to 'godless education.' A large and constantly increasing body of missionaries are endeavouring to prove the overture of the present system, and Protestant and Catholic, so seldom united, join heartily in this. A very different state of things is thus prevalent in Holland from that thoroughly unhealthy which prevails in Prussia. Mr. Gregory's informant says—'It would appear as if Holland and Ireland were on a par as regards the system of National education. Intended to reconcile both religions to a common system, that introduced may be said to have obtained their united disapprobation; and while we behold in Prussia a success almost incredible, after witnessing the results of other efforts for a like purpose, it is reasonable to be forced to the conclusion that any purely secular system would infallibly excite the hostility of those who wish their children to be brought up and educated in the tenets of the faith which they themselves profess.'"

Allow me now to refer to the system of education in the United States, which is very like our system in Ireland, they call their schools "common schools," in Holland they call them "neutral schools," here we call them "mixed," but they are all pretty much the same. The system is of old date in the United States. The Rev. Mr. Fraser who was appointed by the Board of



Feb. 25, 1889.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen

education in England to examine into the state of education in America, travels largely as has report upon those common or mixed schools in the United States. At page 100 he gives an account of the regulations of the schools, taken from the *Mississippi common school law*—

"The school committee shall require the daily reading of some portion of the Bible in the common English version, and shall never direct any school books, calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians, to be purchased or used in any of the township schools." (Chap. 30, r ff.)

In New York schools they read the Scriptures and sing hymns. According to Mr Finser the same is practised in Boston. At Boston the rule is—

"The morning exercises of all the schools shall commence with the reading of a portion of the Scriptures by the teacher in each school; the reading to be followed by the Lord's Prayer, repeated by the teacher alone." (Regulations, chap. 30, sec. 5.)

In Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, a similar system is adopted. Hence religion is not altogether excluded from these schools. However, the Rev. Mr. Finser reports very unfavorably of the effects which are produced by the teaching in them. At page 100 of his report he says—

"By religious instruction, in the same sense which we in England attach to the word, it cannot be said that any progress at all is made under the American school system. Anything like 'sectarianism,' which, as it is interpreted, means anything like doctrinal or dogmatic teaching, anything like the nature of a creed, or which requires children to own the phrase, 'I believe,' is implicitly forbidden in all the schools; in some states it is forbidden in terms."

And again, at page 106—

"As to the results of the association of children of different religious beliefs in the same school, I do not feel justified in pronouncing a very strong or definite opinion. With every approach so carefully barred against sectarianism, and the whole religious teaching (such as it is) being of so almost entirely a unit, there is no room or pretext for quarrelling, nothing that can generate often theological views. It may result, and I think it does result, in indifference, in a depreciation of the value of a creed and fixed forms of faith, and in a more thorough acceptance than elsewhere of the half-truth that 'He can't be wrong who lives in the right.' It need not very readily—It had almost and possibly—in America how little identity in religious feelings, or consistency in religious habits or opinions, appears to be estimated as a detriment is deplorable happiness. In no place have I ever seen the principle of 'agreeing to differ' in matters of religion so thoroughly woven into the tissue of society. It is not at all common to find two or three faiths in one family, and husband and wife separating on the Sabbath (as the Lord's day is always called) to worship with different congregations."

"It is true that the work of the day commences with the reading of the Word of God generally followed by prayer. It is true that devotion, if not fervent attention is paid during both these exercises; but the devotion struck me as being both a result or a part of a discipline than as a result of spiritual impression. There was no 'flour' as it had been the result of 'an angel,' or a spontaneous of kindled hearts. The religious tone of the schools is high; the moral tone, though perhaps a little too self-conscious, is not unduly high; but neither tone which can only be vaguely described in such, but of which one feels oneself in the presence when it is really there, and which, far more of a better sense, I want all the 'religious' tone, one senses and tastes with regret."

Let us now hear one of the Protestant prelates of the United States, the Bishop of Tennessee, who was over lately at the Pan-Anglican Bazaar, and who delivered an address on education in London, from which I take the following—

"He was anxious to lay the secular system open before the meeting, because he believed it was a matter of profound moment, not simply to the Church, but to the people of England, of every name, denomination, or sect, that it should be well understood that the people of England should understand well what they were doing, and not take another leap in the dark."

"Mr. Finser, in his report, said that the intellectual tone of the schools was high, and the moral tone not altogether healthy; but that the religious tone was altogether absent."

There was just no religion at all in it. It was secular, and took no notice of God, or of Christ, or of the Church of the Living God, or, except in the most incidental way, of God's Holy Word. The intellect was stimulated to the highest degree, but the heart and the affections were left unstimulated. It was a system which trained for the business of life, not for the duties of life. As there were differences of opinion about Christianity, it was not allowed to be spoken of, and a knowledge of it was not one of the qualifications for a teacher. A man might be a Mahometan or a Hindu, if he were only proficient in geography, arithmetic, or the exact sciences. The teachers in the normal schools might be infidels, provided they did not openly avow their scepticism; and in point of fact, in the schools which were designed to train teachers only, a vast majority were not Christians."

"It was quite true that in some schools—the number was comparatively small—the Bible was read, and in some the Lord's Prayer was said; but who could presume to call that Christian education? Merely reading the Bible without explanation or comment was not instruction. What would be said of a military school where the professors only read a chapter or two on military tactics, but gave no lessons, made no comments, required no drill? How could they expect mere reading the Bible to the young would make Christian men and women? Not, in the great majority of the schools, even that was not done; and so the youth of the country left the school ready to figure, skilful with the pen, well instructed in the anatomy of the body and the mechanics of the steam-engine, but utterly ignorant of the principles of duty, truth, religion and honor; without knowing the Ten Commandments or the Apostles' Creed. The result was stated by the Rev. Dr. Cleevers, that five-sixths of the people of the United States do not attend any place of public worship. It was this which made a distinguished Prussian remark, 'I came to your country to study its geography, its laws, its institutions, and I find 2,000 religions and nobody believing in a God.' He believed that this lamentable state of things grew out of the secular system. For, the founder of the first reformatory for children, very well said 'Of what use is it to a commonwealth that its rogues should know how to read, write, and cipher? These attainments are only so many master-keys put into their hands to break into the sanctuary of human society.'"

I have letters from several Catholic bishops who speak in the same sense as the Protestant Bishop of Tennessee. These will be interesting. I am sure, as showing the general unity of opinion amongst Catholics and Protestants upon mixed or galled education. The first letter I shall read is from the Catholic Archbishop of Baltimore, Dr. Spalding, a very distinguished writer and a native American. His letter is written on the 25th of December last to myself—

"In regard to the working of our common schools I need scarcely add anything to what I wrote at length on the subject, some fourteen years ago, in the article on 'Common Schools,' which your *Encyclopaedia* will find in the second volume of my *MISCELLANEA*, beginning about p. 200, among my works which I had the honor to send to your Eminence. The first five or six pages discuss the general question, and state pretty clearly and fully our objections to the system as established here, and, after a general view of common school education throughout Europe, the general question returns near the close of the paper. The experience of the system since that time confirms our view and more in the opinion there expressed; crime and idleness have fearfully increased under its operation. Why will not the Government give your Eminence and the Irish people the same right or privilege of separate schools which is granted in England?"

The following are some of the passages from the article on "Common Schools," in the two volumes of his *MISCELLANEA* works to which the Archbishop refers—

"So far as Catholics are concerned, the system of common schools in this country (America), is a monstrous engine of ignorance and tyranny. Practically, it operates as a gigantic scheme for proselytism. By numerous secret appliances, and even sometimes by open and impudently disguised machinery, the faith of our children is gradually undermined, and they are trained up to be ashamed of and to abandon the religion of their fathers. It was bad enough if all this were done with the money of others, but when it is accomplished, at least in part, by our own money, it is really atrocious. It is not to be concealed or denied that the so-called literature of this country, the taste for which is fostered by our common schools, and which is constantly brought to

Feb 22, 1869

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

bear on the training of our children, is not of a character to form their teacher winds to wholesome moral principles, much less to solid Christian piety. In general, so far as it prescribes to be religious, it is anti-Catholic, and so far as it is secular, it is pagan.

"The frightful increase of immorality among the youth of the rising generation, especially in that portion of the republic where the common school system is most fully introduced—as in New England—proves that there is something terribly wrong in our educational system, so very wrong indeed, that the future stability of our country is thereby greatly endangered. Reflecting men of all shades of opinion begin to find this out, and to make an adequate remedy to the constant growing evil, which threatens, in fact, to overwhelm our noble country, and this at no distant day, under the sweeping torrent of popular insanity. Our public newspapers are bristling with the details of heinous crimes—of murders, adulteries, rapes, robberies, and the disgusting details of widespread licentiousness.

"You are may no longer deny it: the great defect, the glaring sin, the blighting curse of our educational system, is the absence from it of a wholesome religious instruction. Under it our children are practically reared up, more like uneducated pagans, preparing merely for the world, than as instructed Christians, well and thoroughly grounded in their faith, and seeking their ultimate for heaven. And such being the case, can we wonder that when they grow up and enter upon the busy scenes of life, they accordingly act more like pagans than like Christians, and fill the land with crime and infamy."

The Bishop of Philadelphia, Dr. Wood, also an American, writes a few lines on the same subject, under date, 20th December, 1868, in which, having declared that he adopts the views of the Archbishop of Baltimore, he says—

"Our struggle against these unfortunate public schools is a practical one. We build school-houses, and pay teachers, and adopt every possible means to withdraw our children, hoping that it some friendly and more sound and equitable public opinion will do us justice.

"Begging your Eminence to accept the sincere expression of my respect and veneration,

"I am most respectfully, your Eminence's humble servant,

"James Wood, Bishop of Philadelphia."

The Archbishop of St. Louis, Dr. Kenrick, a native of Dublin, and a distinguished scholar, writes from one of the great Southern States, on the same subject—

"St. Louis, 2nd January, 1869.

"With regard to our school system, I have to say that it is in principle as gross as impure, and is less objectionable in its character than the Established Church in Ireland, supported in a great measure by Catholic funds. There is no religious teaching in our public schools, and this, in the lower end, we prefer to women's proslavery by means of education. The consequences, however, are equally disastrous of faith and morals. Indifference to religion is the natural and almost necessary consequence of its systematic exclusion from school-teaching. Hence, Catholics almost everywhere in the States, endeavor to provide schools for their children in which they may receive a moral and religious education. Although they have to pay their portion of the money expended in supporting public schools from which they derive no advantage, they contribute to the creation of school-houses and support of schools as if they had no right to claim a more equitable division of the school money than the bad principles—for religious they have none—of those who control public affairs in this country permit them to receive. How different the case in Canada, where separate schools, under such influence as any number of taxpayers may agree upon, are allowed; and those who support them are not only exempt from taxation for school purposes, but are, moreover, positively assisted from the public money. The injustice done to Catholics in the States is exactly equal to that done to Catholics in Ireland by the Church Establishment.

"The result of public school teaching in the States for those who frequent them is very bad. Many Protestants are opposed to it, but are withheld from joining with the Catholics in seeking to have such a change introduced as would associate these schools to those of Catholics or of English by the fact that Catholics would be the great graver by the change. The very general intolerance and immorality which characterize the rising generations of America are attributed by a very large number of intelligent and respectable persons—not Catholics—to the school system which is as poison as the Concoction itself.

"Upon the character of the party that now has the control of matters in England, I fear very much that the denominational system will be replaced by the system that prevails

here and in Ireland. The tendency of modern liberalism is to eradicate religious principle from society, and in so way and this be more slowly effected than by separating learning from the influence by which it may be guided and restrained."

As the common school system has been very fully developed in New York, the judgment of the illustrious Archbishop of that great metropolis, Most Rev. Dr. McCloskey, must be listened to with great interest—

"New York, January 1st, 1869.

"Most EMINENT AND DEAR LORD,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Eminence's esteemed favor of 11th ult., in which you request me to inform you what are the results in this city of our system of public schools, from which religious instruction is excluded, or which are conducted on the 'neutral principle'."

"I can assure you so far as our Catholic children are concerned, the workings of our public school system have proved, and do prove highly detrimental to their faith and morals. So strongly has the conviction of this been impressed upon the minds both of pastors and parents that most strenuous efforts, and even enormous sacrifices, have been made, and continue to be made, in order to establish and support Catholic parochial schools. We have at the present moment in daily attendance at these schools an average number of between eighteen and twenty thousand children. The annual expense for the maintenance of these schools does not fall short of one hundred thousand dollars, while the amount expended for purchase of lots, and erection of proper school buildings, &c., considerably exceeds a million.

"Nothing but the deepest sense of the many dangers to which the religious and moral principles of their children are exposed would prompt Catholic parents to make such great pecuniary sacrifices, or assume such onerous burdens, for it has to be borne in mind that while they are thus obliged through conscientious motives to support their own schools, they have at the same time to bear their share of the taxation imposed for support of the public schools.

"I should remark that our parochial schools are free. The children receive their education, are furnished with books, &c., gratuitously.

"Your Eminence's memory permits me to detail transparently, and even how unjustly our public school system works for Catholic parents and children. We have from time to time received partial relief from appropriations made either by the Common Council of this city, or by the Legislature of the State, but these have no proportion to the actual expenditures we are obliged to make.

"With regard to non-Catholics, very many of the most thoughtful and earnest minds among them see and acknowledge the evils which are the inevitable results of our common school situation. They see that the absence of all religious teaching is weakening the hold which any distinctive creed, or any special denomination, might have on the minds of youth, and that thus growing up in indifference to the religion of their parents, they become indifferent to all religion, and if contrasting to hear the name of Christ, it will be only so long as it may assume a popular name in the country, but ready to be cast off when no opposition or reward will attach to doing so.

"I am deeply and painfully convinced that our common schools, as now organized and conducted, are gradually undermining Christianity in this much favored land. Home influence, and Sunday school training are all that are left to check the growth of infidelity in the minds of the young—but these are insufficient. Protestant clergymen admit it, and in many places are calling upon the people to establish their own parish schools. The Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church when lately assembled in general convention in this city, strongly recommended and urged the establishment of such schools.

"True, as I hope, may work some remedy, but it will only be when the popular prejudice against sectarianism (which, being interpreted in the American sense, means *Fugate*) will be more fully, if not completely, removed.

"The main discussion which took place on this subject was during the time of my distinguished predecessor, Your Eminence well said those in the first volume of 'Works of Archbishop Hughes' in the Diocese of New York, Council of Baltimore (Titular IX.) the official declaration of the Bishops on this subject is given. I may mention that, as that document was clearly prepared by me, it expresses nothing but what I sincerely feel and am willing to endorse. Earnestly hoping that your Eminence and other colleagues may successfully resist all attempts to improve upon your American public school system, and making you long life and happiness,

"I remain, &c.,

"J. McCloskey."

Feb. 22, 1892.

—  
The *Evangelist*  
Catholic.

The Archbishop has since forwaded a printed account of the expenses of his schools for the last year—in New York and in the diocese—which does not extend much outside the city. There were 24,515 children in daily attendance. The amount expended in supporting the schools by the diocese of New York was 132,331 dollars and 47 cents. The amount expended up to the present in purchasing property, sites, and houses for the schools amounts to 1,245,363 dollars and 37 cents.

25531. The *Classroom*.—Does he mention what amount or proportion of public money they get for their schools?—They get very little, though they are taxed for the State or common schools. I believe a great part of the large private Catholic subscriptions just referred to is paid by the Irish inhabitants of New York. This shows that the Irish bring with them to America a great feeling against taxes and in favour of denominational education.

25532. Are we to take it that these schools are too exclusive in their religious character to get the aid of public money?—The Government has established common schools, which the bishops look on as calculated to promote infidelity. If the Catholic people would send their children to these schools they would have a right to a free education in them. As they cannot do so with a safe conscience, they build schools for themselves to which the State, wishing to patronise no other schools but these from which degraded teaching is excluded, contributes nothing. Catholics very occasionally get a site for a school, or get some little assistance from the State, but they are excluded from all substantial Government aid. They are obliged to pay the taxes for the support of the common schools, but they cannot send their children to them, lest they should imbibe infidel principles. Hence the Catholics have to pay for schools to which they cannot send their children, and besides to support schools for themselves.

25533. Is not they occupy a very singular position to the schools of the Church Education Society in this country?—I would not say that the Catholic schools in New York may be compared to the Church Education schools in Ireland. In New York there is a special school tax which Catholics have to pay for schools which they condemn. As there is no school tax in Ireland, the Protestant supporters of the Church Education Society have to support only their own schools. It is to be added that in Ireland Protestants have at their disposal large funds for educational purposes taken at least in part from Catholics, and that—according to the narrow discipline of the Church—the property of such parishes was bestowed with the obligation of providing for the education of its own children.

Allow me now to read a letter from the Bishop of Newark, a very distinguished man, a native American. He has published many documents of great value against this common school system. He writes:—

“Newark, December 28th, 1890

“YOUR EXCELLENCY.—I have received your Eminence's letter of the 17th inst., and take pleasure in complying immediately with your request.

“The system of what is called ‘mixed education’ has been worked out here as fairly as it is likely to be in any part of the world, and it has been in existence for such a length of time as to enable one to judge with a good deal of certainty as to its effects.

“The sole difficulty in the matter is to determine how much of the evils of our American non-id system is to be attributed to it, and how much to other causes. Be-cause, I am so much opposed to it, and so strongly in favour of a positive religious basis for education, that I am afraid that I am hardly a fair judge.

“It cannot be denied that the American people exhibited it in good faith, and with the best intentions. Recognising the evils of ignorance, and the necessity of education in a country, particularly where universal suffrage existed, they intended by means of it to fit the people to govern themselves. Having, in general thing, no sense of the importance of positive religious doctrine, they also thought that this system would do away with religious strife, and cause the people of the country, made up of various races, to become more homogeneous.

“The Americans take a pride in their public school system, though they sometimes complain of the large and

gradually increasing school tax, and the schools are generally pretty well conducted. A large majority of the school teachers are, I think, from New England, which, as Archbishop Hughes says in his preface, “is a country that respects its schoolmasters.”

“Though these schools are organized on the principle that all religious teaching shall be excluded, yet, as a general thing, they are virtually Protestant schools. A portion of the Holy Scriptures is read before opening the school, and I believe the Lord's Prayer repeated; a lesson is sung in most of them. Then there is the personal influence of the teachers, who, of course, colour everything in teaching with his own opinions and prejudices, and except in the largest cities all the teachers are Protestants, or at any rate not Catholics; still, except so far as it may be done by the teacher in his remarks upon points of history, &c., there is no positive religious teaching of any sort. The result is, that the great majority of our American youth are brought up ignorant, self-reliant, unconverted, worldly persons, anxious to make money, careful as a general thing, to preserve a good conscience, but for the most part without any moral restraint.

“My own opinion is that a great deal of the crime of the country, most of the private and public dishonesty which is so prevalent, has its origin in the system of mere intellectual training without religion. What makes it worse, the scanty influence is lost very much by the indifference of the country, not only by the religious indifference of the majority of persons, but by the too common parents of wealth, and the early age at which children are placed in counting-rooms, stores, and workshops.

“Another thing which has been the cause of much injury to the national character and welfare is that the public school system attempts too much; over-education in one sense, by teaching the master branches which belong only to higher education, and thus depriving those to think they know a great deal when they know very little. In a word, that superficial knowledge which is so dangerous, making the children of the poor discontented with their lot in life, and inclined to anything like bad work—and this is one of the causes why all the professions are so overcrowded with persons who would have made very good shoemakers or carpenters, but miserable physicians, lawyers, or ministers.

“I can readily understand from this position, as exhibited in this country, why it should be so well favoured (that is the mixed merely secular education) with the modern Radical school, who have such a horror of the supernatural, it does their work most effectively, and is, as I believe, the greatest enemy of the Catholic Church, and of all dignified faith.

“I have said nothing of the injustice of the system as carried out in this country. As far as it has any religious about it, it is Protestantism, and consequently Catholics are excluded from it, not by the law of course, but by the dangers to which it exposes the faith of those who come under its influence. In most of the dioceses of the United States, the great majority of the Catholic children in the diocese I say may nearly all) are in Catholic schools; yet, whilst we are obliged to support our own schools, without any assistance from the State, we are compelled to pay taxes for the support of the public schools. Instead of Church and State as you have in Ireland, we have School and State.

“I send your Eminence a copy of a pastoral letter, in which I touch upon this matter, and which will give you as any rate, my opinion in regard to it.

“If at any time I can give your Eminence more detailed information, or answer any particular question suggested by your study of the subject, I will do so most cheerfully.

“Hoping to have the happiness of meeting your Eminence in Rome next year.

“I remain, with profound respect,

“YOUR DEVOTED AND MOST OBLIGED SERVANT,

“J. R. BARNETT, Bishop of Newark.”

The pastoral referred to is dated 28th August, 1888, and contains a great deal of very good instructions on the same matter, which cannot fail to be useful in discussing the education question. I will read one or two passages:—

“We cannot see too strong language to both clergy and people, upon the matter of Christian education. The time has passed when there can be any difference of opinion amongst us on this point. Experience has proved that unless Christian instruction and discipline are made to accompany and regulate intellectual culture, it would be better in the majority of cases, for the individual and for society, it looked best left in ignorance. There is nothing that shows more fully how far the American soul has departed from the true idea of Revelation and real Christian civilization, than the absolute manner in which it has considered itself, and the

Feb. 22, 1869

His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen

future destinies of this country to the theory of mere secular education. We may regret the influence of this system toward ourselves, who are taxed to support it, and yet cannot conscientiously take any part in it, but as Christians, believing that the doctrines and principles of Christianity are the necessary basis and principles of Christianity, we must mourn over the folly of any person's greatness, who is laboring to build up a magnificent edifice, are at the same time denouncing the foundations on which it rests. It is absurd to talk of morality as separated from religion and positive dogma. Christian virtue requires constant self-denial, and no person or people will practice self-denial merely to satisfy a sentiment.

"No one who dwells upon the result of the popular education of this country, as exhibited in commercial and legislative transactions, in the halls of legislation, and political combinations, can deny that the whole American mind is much more strongly imbued with the principles of Benjamin Franklin, than with those of the Christian doctrine, and whilst all reflecting and religiously disposed persons are lamenting over these things, declaring that with few exceptions there is no longer any family without secret infidelity, no longer any children over fifty years old, no longer any schoolmaster, or reverend, or honest, if our young women think only of dress and amusement, and are unable to be wives or mothers, that our public men are seeking only their own interests, that real statesmanship has departed from amongst us, that neither the men nor the principles of the slave trade exist any longer; they do not point out the real cause of all this, nor attempt to correct it.

"It is all very well to talk about the American atmosphere, and the spirit of the country, but the American atmosphere, in this sense of the word, and the spirit of the country, result directly from the whole training of the American mind and character. Everybody is talking about education, the advantages of education, the necessity of education; and yet, almost all know none to use the word in its proper and most perfect meaning, as implying the re-education of the intellectual faculties, and even this is done in the most superficial manner, by cramming the mind with facts, instead of making it reflect and reason. The great majority even of those who write upon the subject take no higher view. They seem to have forgotten that education, in its proper sense of the word, must take into account the whole nature of man, with his moral as well as temporal destiny; that it begins with almost the very beginning of life; that its most important lessons, those which have the greatest effect upon the future, are learned in early youth, and that if the heart and soul be not then imbued with the love and fear of God, and the truths of religion, they probably never will be. The necessary but not perfect teacher of a Sunday-school is not sufficient for this purpose; especially when the education of all positive religious truth from the course of instruction during the other six days of the week, convinces the children who are very quick in their apprehension of these things, that those who have the ordering of the matter, do not regard religion as of the first importance, nor in fact of any real importance at all.

"The real difficulty is, that the fathers and mothers of the country are not doing their duty in this respect; that the spiritual guides of the people, instead of imitating revealed dogmatic truth, as the only basis of all Christian morality, are preaching politics and Revolution, and worse than all, that the schools which have taken the formation of the minds of the young out of the hands of parents and ministers, are training them up to be sharp boys, sharp men, evading temporal politics, without religion, and consequently without morality.

"It needs no prophet to tell in the consequences of all this we should, as Christians and Catholics, need any one to teach us our duty under such circumstances, living as we do, in a country where materialism and its offspring, indifference, are gradually taking the place of religion.

"We believe in our holy religion as the revealed will of God, as our infallible guide in all matters of truth and morals, and that the first and chief duty of every man is to labor to secure the salvation of his immortal soul.

"We know that the great majority of the people in every country are obliged to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, and this, not owing to any national organization, but by the very order of God's providence in this world, and that consequently they have neither time nor opportunity to become nobly learned. We are convinced that the best and only real education is that which fits men to discharge their duties in the various conditions of life in which God has placed them, and to prepare them for another and a better world, that 'an humble peasant is better than a proud philosopher,' and that all this formal, superficial education, in which the pupil masters a little of everything and learns nothing, is an evil rather than an advantage, as it only tends to puff him up and make him disconnected with the more humble and ordinary occupations of life.

"As the pastors and spiritual guides of our people, it is our duty to keep these important truths in regard to man's condition in this world and the real end of his existence ever before them, as their only preservative from the false humanitarian systems which are so prevalent in our day, and which tend to pervert the whole order of society."

Such is the substance of the Bishop of Newark's pastoral, which with the other documents already quoted, shows pretty clearly that in the United States the feeling is very much against mixed, and in favor of separate education for Catholics.

We shall conclude our remarks upon education in the United States by the following document of the Plenary Synod of Baltimore, held in October, 1866, which is signed by seven archbishops, thirty-seven bishops, two procurators of bishops, and two abbots—in all forty-eight dignitaries:—

"The experience of every day shows more and more plainly what serious efforts and great dangers are entailed upon Catholic youth by the freemasonry of public schools in this country. Such is the nature of the system of teaching therein employed, that it is not possible to protect young Catholics from incurring through its influence, damage to their faith and morals, nor can we see how to any other means that destructive spirit of indifference, which has made, and is now making such rapid strides in this country, and the corruption of morals, which we have to deplore even in some of our young men. Parents interpose with those of their religion, or of no religion, the daily are at school who assist with calumny and streams our holy religion in its practice, and even its sacred, thus gradually impair its roots of Catholic children, the respect and influence of its true religion. Besides, the morals and examples of its fellow-scholars, are generally so corrupt, and so gross that hence in word and deed, that through continual contact with them, the modesty and piety of our children, even of those who have been best trained at home, disappear like wax before the fire. These evils and dangers do not escape the notice of our prelates, as we learn from the following decrees:—

"(a) Whereas many Catholic children, especially those born of poor parents, have been and are still exposed to several phases of this positive, to great danger of losing their faith and morals, owing to the want of good masters to whom their education may safely be entrusted; we consider it absolutely necessary that schools should be established in which the young may be imbued with the principles of faith and morality, and at the same time receive instruction in letters (Council of Baltimore, No. 32.)

"(b) Whereas the books generally used in schools contain much that is opposed to the principles of our faith, inaccurate statements of our doctrine, and even licensed falsehoods, whereby the minds of the young are filled with error to the grave peril of their souls, the ministers of religion and education, and the agents of the United States Congress, are requested to see that no such books are used in schools (ib. 33.)

"(c) Whereas the character of the public education given in these provinces is generally such as to promote liberty by merely instilling into the minds of the young the false principles of the sects, we wish all parents to use their best diligence to secure a Christian and Catholic education for children, and to take care that the children do not read the Protestant Bible, nor receive the same or prayers used by other religions. They should be required, therefore, to read books or practices of this kind be introduced into the public school, to the peril of faith and piety. All such efforts on the part of the sects should be resisted with firmness and moderation, care being taken to ask the cooperation of those in authority. (Baltimore, No. 34.)

"Now, the best and, indeed, the sole remedy for these most serious evils and inconveniences, in our judgment, is that the schools be created in every diocese, near each church, in which Catholic youth may be saved with instruction, and a liberal education, as well as with religion and morality, as was already sanctioned by the fathers of a former Plenary Council.

"We exhort the bishops, and considering the dreadful evils that spring from a bad system of education, we require them by the bonds of the society of God to take care that schools should be attached to every church in their diocese, and if necessary, and where circumstances allow, as then provide suitable masters at the expense of the church in which the school is attached." (ib. 34.)

In Canada the same feeling prevails as in the United States amongst Catholics. In Lower Canada, where the population is Catholic, the schools are denominational. There were always Catholic schools for Catholics, latterly Protestants have got the same privileges as Catholics. There are schools of their own, and

special provisions are made for maintaining these schools independently, giving full satisfaction to the Protestant population. Mr. Chouveau, who is Minister of Public Instruction, when over two or three years ago, stated he had done everything in his power, though a very zealous Catholic himself, to give the same educational rights to the Protestants of Lower Canada as Catholics enjoy. The Rev. Mr. Fraser, in his report, page 511, makes the following observations—

"The provisions demanded as necessary for the protection of Protestant education in Lower Canada are as follow:—  
 "That there shall be a separate Protestant Superintendent and Council of Public Instruction; the latter to represent, as far as may be, the leading Protestant denominations.

"That perfect protection of the rights of the minority in the domain of their school taxes.

"A removal of 'the manifest injustice' in the dependence of the Protestant school districts on the boundaries which are fixed for parishes and municipalities.

"The recognition of a rule that all provincial aid granted to education by Parliament should be distributed between the Protestant and Roman Catholic departments, according to the population they respectively represent.

"A guarantee securing the permanence of all the higher Protestant educational institutions, which cannot be supported altogether by local rates or public grants, to the Protestant population.—Fraser, p. 312, text.

And may we not here stop to ask if such protection be granted to a small minority of Protestants in Lower Canada, why should not equal rights be guaranteed to the Catholics who form the great majority of the people of Ireland? Why should not their interests and wishes be attended to and respected when so much is done for the few Protestants of Lower Canada? See Mr. Fraser adds—

"There can be no doubt that, in the purely Catholic schools of Lower Canada, the religious and moral instruction of the people is carefully attended to. A large proportion of the teachers are members of religious orders, and the skill and success with which the Christian Brothers discharge their duty in these respects is well known. I presume, also, that religious instruction, though probably of a less dogmatic and definite character, is given in the Protestant dissenting schools. The law, as we have seen, gives to the curé, priest, or officiating minister, the exclusive right of selecting the books having reference to religion and morals, for the children of his own religious faith in the schools.—Fraser, p. 313.

But Mr. Fraser winds up his account of America with the following observations, expressing his opinion that, according to the nature of things, mixed education is an absurdity, and cannot be brought into operation in a way to satisfy any party.—

"The fact remains, that mixed schools, with religious instruction occupying a definite place in their programme, are a phenomenon hardly to be met with on the American Continent. No compromise and no compromise have yet been discovered sufficiently skilful to oppose, or sufficiently tolerant to embrace, the mutual prejudices of Christian communities. It exists in the United States, it was so, though less prominently, in Upper Canada, it is so, though in still smaller proportions here. It looks almost like a law of human nature that it shall be so everywhere."

Let us now turn to Upper Canada where the Catholics are in the minority, and the Protestants in the great majority. Protestant schools were here long established, just as Catholic schools existed for a long period in Lower Canada. If things were to be equitably arranged, the system introduced into this last-mentioned province should have been applied to Upper Canada. However, where Protestants were in a majority, an attempt was made to compel Catholics to attend their schools, and to establish the system so unfavourable to Catholics which prevails in the United States. This plan was resisted by the Catholic clergy, and after a great deal of quarrelling on the matter it was agreed that wherever five families should unite in asking for a school of their own denomination that such a school should be established. In this way the requirements of the Catholic minority are now provided for. I have a letter here from the Vicar-General of the diocese

of Halifax in which he describes in a few words the whole system as it now exists.—

"The law in your Grace is aware, permits, in Upper Canada, in mixed districts, five Catholic boards of families who object to send their children to a common school, to establish a separate or Catholic school, if they can show twenty children desirous of attending.

"These five families are exempt from taxation for common schools, they receive a proportionate share of the public funds, granted by the legislature.

"These teachers are trained in the normal school and allowed every privilege.

"There are in Canada two Catholic normal schools under the direction of clergymen and of nuns of the Ursuline order.

"A Catholic journal of education is published weekly at the expense of Government.

"If a parish or district is too poor to establish a Catholic school, two districts are allowed to be united and one school established in the border.

"The law in New Brunswick permits the fullest freedom in educational matters in that province; any teacher holding a certificate of qualification can establish a school in any place, and if he can show an attendance of twenty-five, he receives share of the public money according to his class as a teacher, even though there may be several other schools in existence in the same district or town.

"Religious instruction can be given without any restriction in all such schools.

"The common school system has been established too recently, in Nova Scotia, to judge of its results.

"In Halifax city for which a law was specially made under which Catholics are allowed to grant to schools under the control of religious denominations, a share of the public money, the only condition required being that the schools are entirely free, and that they may be visited by an Inspector.

"These schools receive £2,500 of the public money. Thirteen years ago separate schools could have been established in Nova Scotia, had it not been for the prejudice of the Catholic members of the Legislature, who objected to the scheme, because it involved some additional taxation."

The recognition of Catholic schools in Upper Canada in the way mentioned in this letter, was not obtained without a long struggle. Every concession was actively opposed by the Rev. Dr. Hymeson, a Protestant clergyman, and chief superintendent of Education in Upper Canada, but in the end the cause of justice triumphed, and freedom of instruction was established. To show how anxious the Catholics were for this boon, I give some extracts from documents published at Toronto during the discussion of the question. The Rev. Mr. Bruyere defending the claims of Catholics writes—

"A denominational law with the motto 'Protection to all—favour to none,' authorizing all religious bodies recognized by the State to establish and govern their own schools, without interference on the part of the State or the religious office, is the only possible solution to the great problem which now perplexes our legislators and politicians—how to share our country with people of dissimilar and discordant views."

In a letter lately addressed to me the Bishop of London, Canada, says—"Let the denominational system be introduced without showing favour to any particular creed, but allowing all denominations to have their own schools according to their respective views; government grants being given in proportion to the relative number of children frequenting such schools." I will add (continues Mr. Bruyere) "that Catholics will never submit to the common school system. The members of the Church of England are heartily disgusted with it. A large portion of the Church of Scotland, and the most intelligent of all denominations protest loudly against it." (Pamphlet printed in Toronto, 1857.)

And here let me add that on the 10th March, 1857, the Archbishop of Quebec, the Bishop of Trois Rivières, and the Bishop of Thia addressed the following letter to the Bishop of London, just mentioned, congratulating him on the opposition he had given to the common schools.

"My lord, we hasten to express to your lordship the heartfelt satisfaction with which we behold your prompt action towards obtaining for the Catholics of Canada the enjoyment of their inalienable rights of having free schools for their children.

"You are upheld in your endeavours by the teachings of sovereign Pontiffs, a decree of the 1st Council of Quebec, and the example of the bishops of the whole world, who are unanimous in proclaiming that mixed schools are dangerous."

Feb. 23, 1859.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.



young men who have that peculiar desire to improve themselves, which is the characteristic of the natives of Bengal, who are perfectly able to receive, and perfectly desirous of following out, the consequence is, that they do read and study the Bible, nobody objecting to, or standing in the way of their so doing. I believe there is more knowledge of the Bible in the Hindu College of Calcutta, than there is in any public school in England." (Report, p. 36.)

Rev. Dr. Carr, one of the Bishops of the Church of England, in India, and Vice-President of the Elphinstone College, Bombay, in his evidence confirms Mr. Halliday's testimony, and shows that moral or religious tests were permitted in the schools (question 9582):

"It shall form no design of the society to furnish religious books, a restriction, however, very far from being meant to preclude the supply of moral tracts, or books of moral conduct, which, without interfering with the religious tenets of any person, may be calculated to enlarge the understanding, and to improve the character." (Id. p. 139.)

Now what is the effect of mixed education in these schools? Has it produced beneficial results? Has it tended to promote Christianity? Let us hear the testimony of officials of the Government, or other English gentlemen residing on the spot and acquainted with the working of those mixed schools.

Mr. Marshall, a Government officer, when examined, says (Q. 8507):—

"Those pupils who have received a superior education, and through that education have been raised above the superstitions of their creed, are still found to be, perhaps, the most strenuous opponents of Christianity." (Id. p. 28.)

Right Rev. Dr. Carr was asked (Q. 9534):—

"Does your lordship think that a purely secular education is likely to create a spirit of infidelity? A.—It has created it in a very great extent, a great part of the young men who have been educated in that school (Elphinstone, Bombay) are complete infidels as regards their own creed." (Id. p. 137.)

In the next answer he adds:—

"They are not only infidels as to their own system, but they have been supplied with the objections of European infidels to Christianity."

Rev. Dr. Charles being asked (Q. 9591):—

"Has the result of the course of education been favourable or adverse to the youths so instructed? A.—The Government course of education, so far as it has produced any effect has tended to undo some of the convictions of the natives and in Hinduism." (Id. p. 139.)

Q. 9592:—

"Has it tended to supply the place of Hinduism with any pure faith?—It has not, it has converted the students, so far as it has operated, to Deism, and to the rejection of all religion."

Q. 9593:—

"Farther even than Deism?—In some cases open Atheism has been professed by some of the scholars of the Government schools, but I should not say that that prevailed to a very great extent." Dr. Charles adds, in a next answer, that the natives "are no longer Hindus in principle, even while they adhere to the external forms of Hinduism." (Id.)

Some other witnesses call the natives *shipoon* infidels.

The Rev. J. Kennedy, A.M., was examined:—

"Q. 9598. Have you any means of telling the Committee what has been the conduct, or what is your impression of the conduct of those who have been educated in the Government schools, without any religious instruction?—In Calcutta I find, during a short residence there, that those who are taught in the Government schools are almost to an individual, open and avowed infidels. In Benares, owing to various circumstances, there is no open opposition to Christianity as the part of those who are taught in the schools; but there, as elsewhere, they come to be *Hindoo*—and generally the impression spreads among them, that all religions are the work of poets and therefore not to be believed." (Id. p. 172.)

"Q. 9599. You have probably heard the expression used, that the Government system produces "dissipated infidels," is that the description which you would be prepared to give of those who have been educated in the Government schools?—It is so, in reference to Calcutta, but not in reference to Benares, and some other places in the Upper Provinces."

"Q. 9601. What has been the result in reference to the schools of Benares, and those in the Upper Provinces?—In the

Upper Provinces by far the greater number have remained quite conformable to Hinduism, owing to the immense native pressure brought to bear upon them, while in Calcutta, owing to the different state of society there, they have come out as scoffers at Christianity, and as practical enemies to their own religion."

Feb. 24, 1860.

His Evidence  
Cardinal  
Cullen

Thus it would be easy to quote many other passages of the same tenor from the Parliamentary Report, but the few extracts we have given appear sufficient to illustrate the working of the mixed system in India, and to show that it has not been productive of good effects.

You will allow me to illustrate the same subject with an example found here at home. The Fourth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education inquiry, 1827, gives an account of a history institution which was opened in 1814, in Belfast. By the rules of this institution, persons of different religious views were admitted to be professors, with the obligation of not teaching anything that would give offence to any of their pupils, among whom were to be found Catholics, Protestants, Presbyterians, and others. The system, indeed, was very like that of the National Board, as appears from the following declaration, published on the 8th February, 1815, by the professors:—"That they owe to the public to pledge themselves as they hereby do that they will continue the same strict impartiality which they have hitherto observed, and never interfere directly or indirectly with the religious faith of any of their pupils of whatever denomination, and that, in particular, they will always treat with deference and respect the religious establishments of the empire." However, notwithstanding that profession, great complaints of proselytism were heard. The matter became so serious, that Government Commissioners were appointed to inquire into it. Three of the Commissioners reported in favour of the institution. Two others, Leslie Foster and J. Glasford, protested against the report, on the ground that there were many Arian and Socinian teaching in the school who infected the pupils with their particular opinions. To show how dangerous those who were examined on that inquiry considered mixed education, I will read a few paragraphs from their examinations.

The first is from the evidence of the Bishop of Down and Connor—who, I suppose, was the learned Dr. Mant. He was asked whether it was proper that a person not believing in the Divinity of Christ, should teach the Hebrew language. He says:—

"I do consider it impossible that any person can give instruction in a class in the Hebrew language, without avowing in that instruction his own views upon particular points of theology. Upon that account, I should say, if it is thought necessary to guard the profusion of religion as taught in the universities, it is right there should be a barrier thrown around the teaching of the Hebrew language. If the Professor of Greek gives lectures upon the Greek Testament, I should think it necessary there should be the same guard as to the Greek Professorship, which I proposed in the first place, as to the Hebrew. My observation is grounded upon the general principle; I do think it impossible that any person can give lectures competently, in the Hebrew language, or in the Greek language, respecting what must be supposed, that the lectures in the Hebrew language contain instruction in the Old Testament; and supposing that the lectures in the Greek language contain instruction in the New Testament, I do think it impossible, I say, that lectures can be given in these languages, in the books of the Old and New Testament, without conveying, at the same time, particular notions of theology."

If, according to this learned prelate, students learning Hebrew or Greek from a heterodox professor, were exposed to great danger of being infected with heretical opinions—must it not be admitted that Catholic children are liable to still greater risks in National schools, when Protestant or Presbyterian masters explain to them the lessons on Scripture, and monthly, found in the National school books?

Dr. Cooke, who died lately, was examined on the same occasion, and pointed out the various ways in which a professor of one religion may set upon the children of a different persuasion, and shake or destroy

Feb 22, 1880

—  
Re-Business  
Cardinal  
Cullen

their convictions. What he says is clearly applicable to Catholic children in National schools, under Presbyterian managers or masters.

"It strikes me," he says, "that a system of education extending religion is the worst thing possible for any country. If the master teach no religion to the boy (I mean in case of a boarding school, where the master comes into the place of a parent), we will scarcely expect much religion in the man. It is true the opportunities of the master are more frequent than those of the professor, & it is also true that the department of a professor may not immediately connect itself with religion. But the character of the professor will make his preceptor religious principles more effectively than any lectures. If the public character of a professor be Arrian or Socinian, it will be seen to lead him not to hesitate his opinions. His literary character and intellectual position will do the work for him most effectually, and so neither what his department may be, upon the religious opinions of his pupils his own religious character will make more or less impression. One of the greatest evils of modern education has been that the concerns of religion have been made to bend to the imaginary necessities of literature and science. Every instructor of youth should teach religion either by word or character, and this principle is peculiarly necessary in the education of candidates for the Gospel ministry."

He was asked then—

"Do you think it would be a good regulation that the Professor of Chemistry should have the power of interfering upon the subject of religion?—The question of education should first take care that his religious principles are good, and then, as occasions offer, he should be as free as others to impress them on his pupils. He should not teach religion instead of chemistry, but his private conversation should be religious."

Rev Mr. Stevelly, Professor of Natural Philosophy, gives some facts which tend to illustrate the working of mixed education, and show how easily Catholic students in Trinity College were induced to change their religion by the company they kept, or by the influence of temporal motives. Having been asked whether the Belfast institution would be a safe place for candidates for the ministry of the Established Church, replied—

"I think it would be just as good as any other school they could be at." The question was then put—"You think there would be no danger of their principles being tainted with?" Answer—"I think quite the contrary. Conversely, as I do, the Church of England to approach nearer than any other to the pure spirit of Christianity, I think it most generally members of other schools having an opportunity of becoming intimately acquainted with its tenets and practices. I know these young gentlemen who had been Presbyterians, and who were candidates for fellowship in Trinity College, Dublin, and many others clerical of the Established Church could be named who had been, when they entered Trinity College, Roman Catholics. In Trinity College Presbyterians and Roman Catholics are educated without signature; and they afterwards find that the opinions of the Church of England are not so very different with their own views as they were led to suppose; they find that there are very profitable employments which they can get into, and they begin to question whether they might not stand to those without hurting their consciences. In consequence of which there are many Presbyterians dissuade in this town, whose sons, being sent to Trinity College, have become Church of England men, whilst the rest of the family have remained Presbyterians."

Rev James Curfild, afterwards, I believe, resident or paid Commissioner of National Education in Dublin, gave some account of the number of Arrians in the Synod of Ulster, from whence teaching Dr. Cooke apprehended so much danger. He was asked—

"Can you form any general opinion as to what proportion of the ministers of the Synod of Ulster are Arrian at present?—I really dare not, there was, for example, one whom we used to consider an Arrian, that disavowed Arrianism upon oath before a Committee of the House of Lords or Commons. I have no means of knowing the proportion. I have heard it stated upon hearsay that there may be from a fourth to a third of the Synod Arrian; but I dare not say that it is so."

Questioned about signing professions of faith, he says—

"I do not look upon the signature of a confession of faith

as at all a guard; it is rather sometimes a cloak under which men creep into such societies, and we dare not question them. After subscribing to such a test we are obliged to take it for granted that they are orthodox, because they have been put to their oath and have avowed themselves so, whilst the whole of their conduct may aim at supplanting the foundations of orthodoxy."

This testimony of the Rev Mr. Curfild, who was well acquainted with Presbyterian practices, shows that promises on the part of professors not to interfere with the religion of pupils cannot well be trusted, and are not always carried out. And if this were the case in a high class academy, such as that of Belfast, where the students were of a rank able to defend their own rights, what are we to say of National schools under Protestant or Presbyterian management and tuition, in which the children are poor, uneducated, and at the mercy of those masters whose control they are placed.

Allow me now to trespass still further on your patience, whilst I call your attention to a primary school which exists in the neighbourhood of Dublin. I suppose it comes within the power of the Commissioners to examine into its state, and to see whether any change ought to be made in it—I refer to the Hibernian Military school. It is within a mile and a half of where we are sitting. This school was founded just 160 years ago, in the year 1720. It was a purely Protestant school up to the year 1839. It has cost an immense amount of money since its foundation. Mr. D'Alton in his History of the County Dublin says that the State had given to it before 1827, £240,000. Since then it has cost still more in the years 1841-63-65, it cost according to a Parliamentary Report, £58,500. The Hibernian school was instituted exclusively for the children of soldiers, but though more than one-half of the soldiers recruited in Ireland are Catholics, the rule of the school was from its first origin down to 1839 that all the children admitted into it should be brought up Protestants. This rule was changed in 1849, but the practice against the rights of Catholics was introduced, that only one-third of the children can be Catholic, whilst two-thirds are Protestant.

26624 The Chancery.—Is the restriction maintained at the present moment?—It is maintained up to the present day; but in 1839, a new charter was granted by Her Majesty to the school, which contains a clause exempting the Catholics from attending at any Protestant religious service, so the Catholics are now entitled to the free profession of their religion.

26625 At the present moment there is, I think, a Roman Catholic chaplain as well as the Protestant?—Yes, since 1839 there has been a Roman Catholic chaplain, but there was no Roman Catholic officer or person of any station employed in the school up to 1841. This matter was brought before Parliament at that time, and orders were given to appoint some Catholics. But there was no Catholic appointed until the year 1865, when one was selected. A Parliamentary return obtained by Mr. Maguire in 1864 gives a full list of all the officers of the school.

26626 What is the seasonal number?—502. It gives a very long list of officials. One sergeant was a Catholic, the gardener, the hospital servant were Catholics, the women in charge of the school-room, the piousness and a farm labourer were also Catholics. Among the higher officers there was no Catholic except the chaplain. There were thirty-five or thirty-six other officials, all Protestants, though one-third of the children were allowed to be Catholic. In 1865, the first Catholic teacher was appointed, his name was Wright. I have heard that he was recommended by the late Dr. Sullivan, and that he had been a pupil in one of the Model schools in Marlborough-street. The remuneration was only £4 or £5 a year and his board. The young man was not very long in the Hibernian school when he began to absent himself from mass on Sundays, and from the prayers or instructions which the chaplain used to give. When complained of he became very insolent, and soon after wrote a letter



to the Catholic chaplain which shows his feelings. Here is his letter:—

"R.H.M.S., 2nd May, 1866

"Sir,—I wish to address a few words to you about the infidelity of the Pope. I would be thankful to you if you would prove this by the Scriptures. It says in Romans 16, from the 18th to the 21st.

"Agree, sir, the Penny Bible says in Mark 8 and 9, 'The devil is made speak thus?' He blasphemeth, who can forgive sin but God only?' Thus, sir, upon whose authority do you forgive us?

"Sir, why do you place Jesus on a level with the saints and angels in making a petition to God? Surely, 'Jesus' is God. How is it the priest drinks wine and gives unto the people bread only? I would be very much obliged to you if you would give me answers to the above.

"I am, sir, yours truly,

"(Signed), T. WATSON, F.-Teacher, R.H.M.S.

"To the Rev. John P. Leonard,

"R.C. Chaplain, R.H.M. School."

The chaplain naturally brought this letter before the Board and after some months the young fellow was dismissed, or went away of his own accord. Since then the Board have appointed three Catholic teachers, who appear to be going on well. There are still, however, grounds of grave complaint, especially in regard to the books. I have got here two or three of the little books that are used in the school. One is a school series of the History of England, by the Rev. G. R. Glegg. The other is Outlines of History of England, for families and schools, published under the direction of the Committee appointed by the Society for promoting Christian knowledge. There is scarcely anything offensive that can be said against Catholics, which is not to be met with in these books. Every now and then they are called "Papists" and "Romanists," and things are represented in a most unfavourable light to Catholics. I have a great number of passages marked, but it would occupy too much time to read them. Here is one passage from "the Outlines," which I have happened to open; it has a remarkable little engraving—boys jumping through a hoop, which will attract the attention of the poor children out of the school. The passage runs thus:—"The art of printing was introduced into England in 1471, by the celebrated William Caxton. This important invention became one means under Providence of spreading abroad that religious light which led eventually to the Reformation. The writings of Wicliffe and others, exposing the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, were widely circulated, and as men became more enlightened on the subject of Christian Doctrine, they grew weary of the system of superstition and intolerance. A rapid advance both in religious information and general knowledge now commenced, and from this period a corresponding improvement in the state of society took place. As Englishmen, we have to thank God, not only for the original introduction of Christianity into our land, but also for having been made partakers in an eminent degree of the blessings of the Reformation." It must be very trying on the Catholic boys to have to study such misrepresentations of their religion, and afterwards to repeat them in their classes to their masters. I have before me a parliamentary return giving a list of the other books used in the school, and many of them are of the same character. None of the higher offices in the school have ever yet been filled by Catholics, and if it came within the power of this Commission, it would be most desirable to recommend that some of the offices should be Catholic, and that Catholic teachers should be appointed in proportion to the number of Catholic boys in the school. This would be in conformity with the charter granted by Her present Majesty. This charter says:—"And whereas it is very desirable that the advantages of a national establishment should be accessible to the families of soldiers of all religious persuasions, as far as can be done, without impugning the order and discipline necessary for the institution," and then it adds, "We do

declare and ordain that every child of a Roman Catholic soldier shall be exempted from receiving in any of the said hospitals most notice, in the principles of the Protestant religion established in Ireland, and that every child of a Roman Catholic soldier, or the child of a soldier belonging to any sect of Protestant Dissenters, shall be exempted from the duties of learning or being educated in the catechism of said Protestant Church, and shall also be exempted from attending public worship as performed in said church, if same be inconsistent with the religious belief of such soldier. And further, we do hereby ordain and declare that every such child be permitted under such regulations as the discipline of the establishment may require, to attend the public worship of the religious profession of such soldier."

24637. What are the provisions made now as to the Roman Catholic children attending religious worship?—The Roman Catholic chaplain says mass for them every Sunday, and frequently gives them an opportunity of attending to their other religious duties. However, the labours of the chaplain cannot be as successful as they ought, because he does not reside in the school, and can have but few opportunities of exercising his influence over the religious conduct of the boys. The Protestant chaplain resides in the school; the same is to be said of the principal officers and the greater part of the teachers who are Protestants.

24638. Where do the Roman Catholic boys go on Sundays?—There is a separate chapel for them in the establishment, where they are assembled every Sunday, and get religious instruction from the chaplain. Besides, they meet once or twice a week in the chapel, to be taught the catechism, and to be instructed and prepared for the sacraments. I have gone there several times myself to confirm the children, and I have found them well instructed in the catechism. But it is to be regretted that the instruction in the schools is not suited for Catholic children, and that the histories and other books they read are calculated to make bad impressions on them, and even to shake their faith. Indeed, in several instances, Catholic children have abandoned the faith of their fathers, and joined the Protestant church. If the charters granted by Her Majesty were properly carried out, this would not have occurred; according to that charter in the school the Catholic boys should not receive any religious instruction other than Catholic religious instruction. When they read the histories referred to they receive instruction most hostile to everything Catholic.

24639. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What is the date of the charter?—The copy which I have here is printed in 1842, but the charter of the present Queen, to which I have referred, is dated the first year of her reign. I have now finished the statement which your lordship so kindly permitted me to make. I fear the patience of the Commissioners must be worn out by the long account I have given of mixed education in several countries, and by the attempt I have made to illustrate its workings by reference to particular institutions. If I have occupied your attention so long, it was only because I thought it might be useful to show how far experience and the weight of authority are in favour of denominational education.

24640. The Chairman.—Your Eminence wished to show that under very various circumstances both in the Old World and in the New the Roman Catholic authorities universally performed themselves in favour of denominational education?—That is precisely what I wished to show. This is useful for Catholics in a doctrinal point of view. For when we find that Catholics spread over the world, pastors and people agree upon a religious matter connected with the salvation of souls, we say with St. Augustine, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum," and we feel that this universal consent is an infallible argument of truth.

24641. Sir Robert Kane.—Your Eminence mentioned in the early part of the day that it was an objection to the National system of education as it exists here that the Catholic children in many cases received religious instruction from persons of a different religious denomination?—Yes, I think that is a very

Vol. 21. (1866).  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb. 22, 1869.  
—  
His Honour  
Catholic  
Catholics

serious objection against it. As to the fact alluded to, it is expressly stated in the Report for 1859 that of the Roman Catholic children attending Protestant National schools, 1,816 joined in the Scriptural classes under Protestant teachers. Since then a return has been obtained in Parliament on this subject by Mr. O'Reilly, and I give an extract from a speech which he made in Parliament on the same matter. This extract will show how this mixed religious education is carried on, and to what evils it exposes Catholic children. I quote from Hansard's Report of Debate, 16th May, 1866:—

"In one of the returns from a Presbyterian school in (Mr. O'Reilly) found it stated that the 'Roman Catholic pupils attend the religious instruction, but they do not take part in it'—a distinction which he confessed himself totally unable to comprehend. In another school the teacher, who was of the Established Church, 'instructs in religious pupils of all creeds,' and he did not find that any Roman Catholic books were used in the school. In another instance it was stated that 'Roman Catholic pupils receive Presbyterian instruction.' In another that 'Roman Catholic pupils receive religious instruction from a Presbyterian minister in a Protestant course of instruction.' In another that the 'Catholic pupils receive instruction in the Presbyterian catechism,' and in another that they receive instruction in the catechism of the Church of England—and here it was stated, and it was the only instance in which it was—that it was with the sanction of their parents."

These are statements extracted by Mr. O'Reilly himself from the returns which he moved for as to the religious instruction given in the various schools throughout Ireland. I think the occurrence of such things is very objectionable; but I do not see how it can be prevented so long as the schools are mixed; if a Presbyterian master or even a Catholic he may not allow them to learn the Catholic catechism, and generally there will be no means of instructing them in it elsewhere. If Catholic children attending a Presbyterian school get any religious instruction at all it will be Presbyterian instruction, imparted to them by word and by example. I recollect myself when I was in the north the care of a school at Keady, a little town a few miles this side of Armagh. I went there to hold a confirmation of the children and I found that they were not well instructed in their catechism. When I asked what was the reason, the parish priest told me there was no school in the town except a Presbyterian school, and that the Presbyterian managers would not allow the Catholic catechism to be taught in it. It was a country place, and the children could not be got together except in the school, and so they were left without any religious instruction.

26642. The Chairman.—Was this a non-vested school?—A non-vested school so far as I recollect, what I refer to happened in 1851. From that circumstance I began to think that things were not going on very well with regard to Catholic religious instruction in schools under Protestant management.

26643. Sir Robert Kane.—Then your Honour would, of course, consider that anything which would tend to increase the proportion of Catholics receiving instruction from teachers of a different denomination would be an aggravation of the evils which the present National system presents?—I would like to see nothing but denominational schools, and every increase of mixed schools I think an evil.

26644. Your Honour is, of course, acquainted with the general principles of the schools of the Church Education Society?—I have a general idea of them; I have looked over some of the reports which they have published.

26645. You are aware they are purely denominational schools, in which the doctrines and feelings of the Church of England are taught?—I have heard that the managers of those schools do not actually make Catholic children read the Bible, or learn the Protestant catechism, so that if any Catholic children attend them, they are protected as much as they are in National schools under Protestant management. Protestant children read the Bible and learn hymns and psalms, but, according to the latest accounts I

have heard, Catholic children are not obliged to do so. This, however, is only a negative advantage, and it is very wrong for them to go to schools where they do not learn their own religion.

26646. Are the Catholic children removed from the schools?—There are very few Catholics in them at present. Some years ago, perhaps, from 50,000 to 80,000 Catholic children attended them, now, I think, there are not much over 4,000 in all Ireland, about six for each parish. Ever since the Synod of Thurles the number has been going down, and I hope in a few years there will be no Catholic children in those schools.

26647. In the last year for which the figures are given, I find the number of Catholic children receiving instruction in the 1,460 schools of the Church Education Society was 5,871?—I could not give the precise number; I said 4,000, that will give little more than four to each school.

26648. But in the returns which your Honour quoted as to the schools under the National Board the number of Catholic children receiving religious instruction from teachers of a different denomination was 1,800, scattered amongst upwards of 6,000 schools?—The Board admits that that number receives Protestant instruction directly and openly; but there are tens of thousands of Catholic children getting indirect religious instruction from the influence and example of Protestant teachers. As to the Church Education Society, it does not require the Catholics to read the Bible, or to learn the Church Catechism, so that actually they do not receive religious instruction in these schools.

26649. Master Brooke.—I think you are under a mistake as to that. They are not obliged to learn any formularies of the Church, but the reading of the Scriptures is indispensable on the part of every child who goes to a Church Education school?—That makes the matter worse than I imagined.

26650. It is a fundamental rule?—I was under the impression that latterly that rule had been changed. Probably my informant was under a mistake. Now that the truth is known, I hope that as soon as possible all Catholic children will leave these schools, because in going to them they are violating the discipline of the Church, which will not allow the Bible to be made a mere school book, and acting in opposition to what common-sense dictates, in the poor children must be made a religion out of the Bible. Hence it is to be desired that all Catholic children should leave schools which they cannot attend without going against the authority of their own Church.

26651. Sir Robert Kane.—At present the Church Education Society is a purely voluntary society?—Yes; it appears to be supported by subscriptions, principally from England.

26652. Under a denominational system aided by the State, of course the Church Education Society's schools would be entitled to a grant upon the same foundation as the Catholic schools?—If they regulate them in the same way as we manage ours, I don't think there should be any objection. I lay down the principle that the schools are to be denominational, so that the Church Education Society schools shall be Protestant in name and reality, and our schools be Catholic. Each class of schools could then truly claim a Government grant, just as Protestant and Catholic schools do in England.

26653. Would your Honour contemplate that under these circumstances they should be prevented from allowing Catholic children to frequent their schools?—If they used any unfair proselytising, I would prevent them, and have the grant withdrawn. That is if they were to bribe children, or if teachers were to force children to attend, I think Government should stop in and take away the supply. If the children go without being forced, or without being bribed, or without being unjustly influenced, let them parents be responsible for them. But if the managers, or patrons, or trustees of a school were to use improper means to get the children to attend, I think the Go-

verment should interfere and stop the grant. And I would do the same in regard to Catholic schools. If Catholics were to bribe or force Protestant children to go to their schools they ought to be prevented and the grant withdrawn. However, I believe the Irish Catholics have never been charged with proselytism.

25654. Under the denominational system, your Excellence considers the intervention of the State might still be necessary, in order to prevent persons of one religion from interfering with those of another religion?—It may be necessary as a financial matter, so far as to stopping any grant. I think the State would be quite justified in stopping the supplies where things were done improperly.

25655. Is there any reason to suppose that under a denominational system supported by the State, the managers of schools, such as those of the Church Education Society, would be less anxious to obtain the attendance of Catholic children than they are at present?—I don't know what their feeling would be, but the experience of three centuries shows that we need not fear them. I would not dread proselytism if it were exercised without violence, threats, or bribes, and I would stop the grant to the school if it were.

25656. My Lord Cardinal, who would be the judge of fairness?—I suppose the Board would be constituted of a fair body of men, and that they would be able to see whether the acts performed by the managers of schools, were fair or not. Of course the clergy would watch the interests of their own flock. If a Catholic were acting improperly, the Protestant clergyman would complain. If any Protestant were acting unfairly towards Catholics, the Catholic clergyman would plead the cause of his own congregation.

25657. Your Excellence would allow the State to retain its prerogative of deciding whether schools were unfairly interfering with one another?—The question whether the managers of a school are acting honestly or not, can be easily decided. Under the denominational system a school should be Catholic or Protestant. If the manager or protector of a Protestant school (or vice versa) try by unlawful means to get children into the school, he ought to be punished for doing so, by losing the school grant. It is very easy for a board, or for any respectable body of men, to determine whether a manager is acting fairly or not. Common sense will dictate what ought to be done in each case. Even at present the National Board must decide questions such as these we are referring to.

25658. You mentioned with reference to the system of education in France, and the fact of its being based upon the denominational principle, that they allowed schools in any locality to be either Protestant or Catholic, according to the nature of the population—your Excellence is aware of how the schoolmasters are appointed in France?—The argument I wished to draw from the example was that expressed by Monsieur De Pansin, whose words I quoted, viz., that the legislation on schools tended to put an end to the mixed system, but I believe the French laws on education contain many objectionable enactments, and recent discussions in the Senate in Paris show that the higher schools frequently are tainted with infidelity, and are conducted on principles hostile to religion. Now the schoolmaster is generally appointed by, I may call it, a committee. There is a Council appointed in each commune, which manages the affairs of the schools, it appoints the masters, but the parish priest is always a member, and a principal member of the committee, and he has very great power in the appointment and removal of the master; besides that he has the right and the duty of visiting the school, and of seeing that nothing improper be taught in it. I have here, but I suppose it is too late at this hour to refer to it, the Calendar of public education in France. There are very many training schools kept by religious communities of men, and several training schools kept by Christian Brothers, or other brothers, to prepare masters for this work. You will see what an immense number of children are in the religious schools in France—schools that are entirely under the care of religious;

there are more than two millions of children in these schools. The training schools for females are very much in the hands of religious ladies—and those for masters often in the hands of religious men, so that there is a good chance of the teachers getting a fair religious training in these schools. When masters take possession of a school, they are obliged to teach the catechism, read religious books to their pupils, and accompany them to mass. All this refers to Catholics, but Calvinists and Lutherans have similar privileges.

The religious system followed in France is adopted also in Prussia. I was at Aix la Chapelle some years ago, and I saw the master bringing a great number of boys to mass, and the mistress bringing a great number of girls—the boys sang one portion of a hymn, and the girls sang another portion, during mass, just as in France.

25659. Generally, the mode of managing schools in France is by the council of each commune?—There is a council in each commune; the parish priest is always a member, the mayor, or the head of the commune, is another; and there are three or four others elected to manage the affairs of the school.

25660. So that the parish priest in exercising the useful influence which he does exercise over the school does so in co-operation with the civil authorities?—I don't think the management of the school is interfered with so far as religion is concerned at all by any one except the parish priest. The parish priest has the control of everything connected with religion. In financial matters, and in appointing or removing the master, he is assisted by the council of the commune. However, it must be said that everything regarding education is not perfect in France. The Government on the one side interferes too much with the liberty of public instruction, and on the other side there is an infidel faction anxious to bring up the rising generation without any knowledge of religion. I read on yesterday in a French paper an account of a public meeting held last week in Paris by a body of workmen, who by a recent law are allowed to meet and discuss points of importance to the State. At the meeting to which I refer, the question for discussion was education, and several speakers proposed to prove that no one ought to peddle any religion until he is at least twenty years of age, that schoolmasters and parents ought to be prohibited from speaking to children about religion till they reach that age, thus adopting an old theory of Rousseau, which would soon make all the world infidel. Tangent not in the way they ought to be in France, but they are improving. Since 1830, in consequence of the legislation then adopted, an immense progress has been made in giving a religious tone to primary education; but the infidelity of the schools of medicine, of law, and of philosophy, is still a matter of complaint. This important subject has of late been often brought before the Senate, and it is expected that within a very short time Government monopoly, the source of great evils, will be overthrown, and the same freedom extended to the high schools which, to a great extent, has been granted to primary institutions.

25661. I believe no school can be opened in France without the sanction of the Government?—None of the higher schools can be opened without the sanction of the Government; the lower schools are opened with the sanction of the prefect of the department. Some of these primary schools are supported by the State, or the commune, and, as a matter of course, cannot be established without the concurrence of the State. The primary schools called *free schools* are supported without any public assistance. Their establishment must be notified to the authorities; but it appears a mere formality. The law of 15th March, 1850, Title I, Art. 21, shows how little control is exercised over the *free schools*. "L'instruction des écoles libres porte sur la moralité, l'hygiène et la salubrité. Elle ne peut porter sur l'enseignement, que pour vérifier s'il ne peut contraindre à la morale, à la constitution, ou aux lois."

25662. The prefect of the Department represents

Feb. 22, 1862.  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

the Government!—He represents the Government, and must be consulted on almost everything. This continual interference in matters connected with education is not at all to be admired. When Governments take the question of education into their own hands, they are sure to go astray, and to do mischief, and, what may appear strange, a stronger revolutionary spirit prevails amongst the teachers who altogether depend on the Government than amongst any other class. I suppose the same may happen among ourselves. It appears from a return made to Parliament that some, not very many, schoolmasters have been found to be Biblesmen or Fontanes.

25653. Your Eminence is aware of the manner in which the inspection of schools is carried on in France, the Inspectors are, I believe, nominated by the Government?—The Minister of Public Instruction appoints the Inspectors, with the concurrence of one of the Councils of Education.

25654. The Superior Council of Education.—The Superior, or General Inspector, as is nominated by the Minister, after consultation with the Superior Council; but the inferior Inspectors are named by him *Apres avis du Conseil Académique*. Each department has an *Académie* Council, and each *arrondissement* has an Inspector. The one, as parish priest, is *ex-officio* Inspector in his district, according to the law of 1850, ch. 3, art. 18. There is one inferior Inspector for each department. There are some other degrees of inspection carried on under the control of the higher Inspectors.

25655. Although the schools are for the most part denominational, is it the fact that the Inspectors are not appointed upon any denominational plan?—You are aware that in France nearly all the people are Catholic. There are thirty-eight millions and some hundreds of thousands of people in France, according to the last census, and of these there are about 600,000 Calvinists, and from 400,000 to 450,000 Protestants. The schools are denominational, some being for Catholics, others for non-Catholics, and very few mixed. It is to be supposed that the inspection in such circumstances will follow the character of the school, and that the Inspectors will be generally Catholics.

25656. As a matter of fact, of course the great majority of the Inspectors of schools in France are Catholics, but as matter of principle, is your Eminence aware whether there being Catholic does not involve any portion of the law?—I think as a matter of fact that the Inspectors are appointed according to the religion of the school. If Jewish or Protestant Inspectors were charged with the inspection of Catholic schools, I am sure there would be great complaints. However, having examined the law regarding Inspectors, I think there is nothing in it requiring them to be of any special religion. The law is rather infidel in France, it does not look much to any religion; but still it reserves all questions relating to religion to the ministers of each Church.

25657. Is it the fact that the schoolmasters, or the teachers of schools in France, must have been trained as masters, and must have passed certain examinations to obtain what they call a  *brevet de capacité*?—Yes, a sort of diploma, or certificate of capacity, is necessary, except in some few cases, for all who wish to open any school, even a free school not supported by the State. But this would not be tolerated in free countries. There ought to be free trade in education.

25658. Then your Eminence is adverse to any diploma or certificate of capacity being gained by the teachers before being required to take charge of schools?—I would let the people give the certificate themselves. If the children are properly taught the schools will be well frequented, if the master be unfit to teach, he will soon be without scholars. In the end liberty will work better than restrictions and systems of examination and certificates. The French system of interfering in everything is most expensive to the State, and does not produce any good to compensate the outlay.

25659. Notwithstanding that the French system is denominational, your Eminence is not quite prepared to see just that system established in this country?—I think the French system is very much opposed to our ideas of liberty and constitutional government, and I would not wish to see it introduced among us. The system, so far as it is denominational, works very well; but, so far as it is restrictive of the rights of the subject, there are great complaints about it, especially in the upper schools.

25670. In these regards is it not the fact that the Prussian system is subject to a good many of the same defects?—Yes, education is made compulsory in Prussia, and that is a very serious thing for the poor people. Then all the masters must have diplomas, as in France. Besides, the State interferes in many instances, and a great body of educational agents is maintained at a great cost, and without any corresponding advantage. However, in Prussia, the denominational system is carried out most rigidly. There are separate training schools, of every description, for each religious denomination. And the bishop has jurisdiction over every Catholic training school in his diocese, and the parish priest is the head of every ordinary school in his parish. Every training school has a resident Catholic clergyman to instruct the pupils in religion, and direct their moral conduct. But the Prussian restrictions upon liberty would not be suited to this country. I think we ought to endeavour to remain free in educational matters as long as we can.

25671. In Prussia is the parish priest, at the same time that he supervises the religious instruction of the school, is he also the head of the secular department?—He leaves the secular teaching to the master, or the managing committee; but he has a right to see that the teacher shall not introduce anything against religion in his secular teaching. That is the proper supervision of the priest, and, it is necessary. I once heard of a teacher, who gave to his pupils to copy, the words—"The Pope is Antichrist." The master, whilst teaching writing, was interfering with religion. At present, many things are taught about geology, ethnology, and anthropology, subjects very innocent in themselves, which are termed by the masses of men against religion. It is necessary that religion should have some control over such secular matters.

25672. But the secular instruction, subject to the supervision which your Eminence describes, is conducted by the master as an officer of the State, and subject to the control and direction of the State authorities?—Yes, in connection with the parish priest, or with the bishop where there is question of a model school. Where the priest has full power to teach religious doctrines to the children, to teach them as fully as he likes, and when the teacher co-operates with him in doing so, and when the teacher does not introduce anything hostile to religion in his lessons, the priest must be satisfied—he has nothing to complain of. But the master should teach by word and example.

25673. The appointment of the master is vested, I believe, in the local committee or council of the commune, as it is in France?—Something in the same way. I do not think it is precisely the same.

25674. Of which the parish priest is the general chairman?—The parish priest has much more power in Prussia than he has in France. I believe the Prussian Catholics were so well pleased with their position that they acted with the greatest loyalty during the late war; they did everything they possibly could to support the authorities and to show their anxiety for the welfare of the State.

25675. In the case of small communes which do not allow of the formation of two good schools, I believe that both in Prussia and France the arrangement is to have a mixed school?—In France as the population is generally Catholic, and the Protestants are principally found in certain limited localities, the necessity for mixed schools does not often arise. In Prussia, where the population is more mixed, the case occurs often. If the commune be too small, or if Catholics or Pro-

students be too few to make separate schools, both parties unite and make one school; but the religious opinions of each must be respected. This same system might be introduced into Ireland in similar exceptional cases. But the rule should be as in Prussia, that the schools in general should have a religious character, and that ample provision should be made for the religious instruction of the children. Where there are mixed schools both in Prussia and France, the Catholic Cui has always the right to visit and instruct the Catholic children.

26676. I understand your Eminence to say, in the early portion of your evidence, that you would not entirely object to a similar arrangement in localities in Ireland, which were not sufficiently populous to form two separate schools?—I said I would not be opposed to that arrangement, that if it were found necessary, it could be carried out in small places, but sufficient vigilance should be exercised to protect the religion of every particular class. At the same time I think where such small fractions of population are found, the clergyman of the district ought to be able to provide for the education of his little flock. I read a report drawn up by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1830, in which he gives an account of the state of the diocese at that time (Catholic schools were then prohibited); but he states that in several places the parish priest or the curate used to open schools for the Catholics and teach the children everything that was necessary for them. Where some few persons may now happen to be left without a school, the parish priest or the parish minister could do the same.

26677. Your Eminence referred to a letter from the Bishop of Liège, discommending the efforts made there to establish a mixed school?—Yes, the case was this. Some Catholic ladies having got an idea into their heads that there was something very useful in mixed schools, determined to erect one at Liège, and presented a programme to the bishop, explaining the nature of their undertaking. Common Christianity was to be taught in the school; clergymen of different religions were to give separate religious instructions in it, and it was to be somewhat like an Irish model school. The bishop, having learned the character of the project, verbally explained his reasons against it, and exhorted the ladies to abandon it. However, they published their programme, and stated that the bishop would appoint a chaplain to the new school. This statement compelled the bishop to publish his letter against the proposed school, and to announce that he would not appoint a chaplain, lest he should seem to sanction an institution, founded on principles hostile to the Catholic religion.

26678. From the fact of those ladies proposing to establish such a school, it would appear there is

nothing in the Belgian law of primary education to prevent that?—There is full liberty of education in Belgium. The Catholics have a University, the Government has two, and even the infidels have a University at Brussels. I think if the Mahomedans wished to establish a school in Belgium there would be no one to prevent them.

26679. Would your Eminence inform the Commissioners of the position the parish priests in Belgium occupy in relation to the schools?—I think that all through Belgium the parish priests occupy a position similar to that which the priests occupy here. They are managers of many schools in Belgium, and have a great control over them. At the same time the Government of Belgium has lately manifested great hostility to the rights of the Catholic clergy. In Holland, a vast number of schools is also under the clergy, got up, both by Protestants and Catholics, in opposition to the Government so-called secular schools.

26680. In Belgium is there a central committee or council, as in France or Prussia, for the management of the schools?—I think not in Belgium. I think it is left to the people to do as they like. I suppose in some places they get up committees. We do it in Ireland.

26681. There is no State aid towards the support of such schools?—I think that in Belgium there are parochial funds, very large funds for the support of schools, not immediately under the control of the Government. In France the first revolution swept away all educational endowments, but Belgium retained some funds for its public schools.

26682. Contributed by the parish?—I think they are funds left from time to time, some of an old date, by pious benefactors to support the schools, and what remains of the funds thus handed down is supplemented by the communes or the provinces. However, I do not well recollect how things stand.

26683. The *Chevreton*.—Do they not also get some proportion of the taxes for these local purposes in Belgium?—I cannot speak with accuracy on the financial arrangements of Belgium, but I think that the schools are supported by local contributions supplemented by Government grants, nearly in accordance with the French system. I must add that I have not given much care to the study of the financial arrangements of other nations; what I attended to in the several countries to which I have referred, was the bearing of education on religion; and I have studied enough to convince me that the feeling of Catholics in every part of the world is, that mixed education is most detrimental to religion, and that no system of instruction can be truly useful, unless it unite the acquirement of religious with that of secular knowledge.

[Adjourned.]

SEVENTEENTH DAY.—DUBLIN, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1869.

## PRESIDENT.

The Right Hon. the Earl of POWELL, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. The Earl of DUNMURRAY, K.F.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACKAY.  
The Right Hon. Mr. JUSTICE MONAGHAN.  
Sir ROBERT KANT, F.R.S.  
WILLIAM BROOKES, Esq., M.C.  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORRIS COWIE, D.D.  
JAMES ARTHUR DEAR, Esq.  
JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q.C.  
SCOTT NANCYTH STOKES, Esq.  
WILLIAM R. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.  
LAURENCE WALDRON, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C., } *Secretaries*.  
D. R. DUNNE, Esq., }

Feb 23, 1869.

Thomas  
O'Hara, Esq.

THOMAS O'HARA, Esq., sworn and examined.

26684. The Chairman.—How long have you been one of the Inspectors of the National Board?—Six years in April next.

26685. What is your district?—Clonmel at present.  
26686. Sir Robert Kane.—The district with which you are connected as Inspector is one in which the population is principally Roman Catholic, I believe?—Yes; the great bulk of the population is Roman Catholic.

26687. There is, however, a certain admixture of Protestant denominations there?—There is an admixture of Protestants, but very small as compared with the Catholics.

26688. How does that affect the attendance upon the National schools of the district—are these schools exclusively Catholic as to their attendance, or do they, generally speaking, contain any proportion of Protestant children?—The great bulk of the attendance is Roman Catholic, but about one-half the schools, so far as I am aware, have a mixed attendance of Protestants and Catholics.

26689. Does that mixed attendance arise in the natural course of supplying the educational wants of the locality, or is it a casual attendance owing to temporary residence?—I believe the attendance is quite natural, that is, the Protestants attend because it is most convenient to them to attend. The attendance cannot be casual on the part of the Catholics, who form the bulk of the population. Neither is it casual on the part of the Protestants, because they attend the schools in their neighbourhood.

26690. Do you consider that rather more than one-half the schools in your district contain a certain proportion of Protestant children as a part of their ordinary attendance?—Yes, I am certain of that. Latterly, when I found I was to be summoned here, I commenced taking notes of all those in which there is a mixed attendance, and of those in which there is not. I could have taken notes of 163 schools had time permitted, but when receiving the summons to attend before this Commission on a previous occasion, I commenced taking the notes, and I have been able since to visit only eighty-four. Of these eighty-four schools so visited I found that forty-seven have a mixed attendance of Catholics and Protestants. If you allow me to correct that remark, these forty-seven schools are the number in which I found Protestants on the rolls of the schools or attending. There were other schools which had mixed attendance, but in which there happened to be no Protestants at the time of my visit.

26691. What proportion did the number of Protestant children attending the schools bear to the total number?—I found one school with only one Protestant upon the rolls. I found several schools with three, four, six, or eight, or ten; from one to ten is the general rule, except in the town of Clonmel.

26692. But in the town of Clonmel the proportion of Protestants was largest?—Yes, considerably larger, and in the town of Cahir also, in newly established schools, there are considerably more than ten Pro-

testants, so far as I learn, attending that school, but it is not included in my notes, inasmuch as it has been only recently established, and I have not yet visited it, but in all the schools I visited the number of Protestants is generally from five to ten, with the exception of those in the town of Clonmel, in which there is a large proportion of Protestants.

26693. From your acquaintance with the Roman Catholic middle-class population in your district, and from your knowledge of their wishes, do you think there exists amongst them any very strong desire to replace the present system of mixed education by a strictly denominational system?—So far as I can form an opinion, from conversations with Roman Catholics in the district, I don't think there is any desire to change the mixed system for the denominational system. I think the contrary feeling prevails.

26694. You think that they acquiesce in receiving the present system as one which is suited to their wants, and calculated to supply a good education to their children without interfering with their religious principles?—That is the opinion of the Protestants and of the lay Catholics, so far as I am aware.

26695. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Are these schools chiefly managed by the parish priests?—They are. There are very few schools under any other management than that of the parish priest.

26696. Are there any Church Education schools?—There are a few in the district.

26697. Do you think the Protestant children would rather come to the National Board schools than go to the Church Education Society's schools—do they as a fact?—They do as a fact. I am acquainted with two Church Education Society's schools in my district, which are in operation at the present time—one in Clonlara, the other in the village of Ardaraun. I am aware that in Clonlara a great proportion of the Church of England people left the Church Education school and attended the National school. In Ardaraun I am aware some of the very few Protestant residents in the village go two miles to the National school.

26698. Is that because the National school is the better school?—Yes, that is the only reason I can assign for it. The instruction is found to be much more efficient in the National schools than in the other. Then, on the part of the Protestants there is no preference shown for receiving mixed education. The rector of Clonmel is opposed to it, and wishes his own denomination should attend the Church Education school, but from conversations with Protestant laymen I am aware that they prefer the National system to the Church Education system.

26699. The circumstances of the towns are not so important as those of the country districts, where there are small minorities. Are the Protestants numerous enough in Clonmel to keep up a school of their own if they wish it?—Yes.

26700. But are there not other places where there are so few Protestants that the pupils for a Church Education school must necessarily be small in number?—It

Feb. 27, 1902.

Thomas  
O'Hara, secy.

must necessarily be small in such a place as Ardara. In Clogheen, with a population of about 2000, the Church of England Protestants attend the National school in preference to the local Protestant school.

26704. Are the Protestants the minority all through your district?—They are the minority in every place throughout the district.

26705. Does your experience lead you to the conclusion that where the Roman Catholics are a minority the same operation takes place?—I have not been superior in any place where Roman Catholics are a minority. I have resided in Fermanagh and Derry. I am aware that in some parts of Derry, where Roman Catholics are in a minority, some are in attendance in schools under Protestant management.

26706. Do they go to them by choice or necessity?—I believe they do it because they are free to do it.

26707. If there were no other school they would, of course, go to the National school; but if there were a Christian Brothers' school or a convent school in the neighbourhood, there would then be a choice. The question is whether the people, if they had the choice, would prefer the National school to the denominational school. Can you give evidence on that point from observation or from what you reasonably conclude would be the case from experience?—I am aware that Roman Catholics, when they have the opportunity, prefer going to a National school, if under Roman Catholic management, to going to a denominational school; but I could hardly say it is the case that they would prefer going to a National school under Protestant management.

26708. Do you say from your Clogheen experience, that Protestants do not mind going to a National school under the management of the parish priest?—Yes, so far as my Clogheen experience, I am well aware that where people are free to choose between a denominational and a National school they prefer the National school.

26709. That is, Protestants do?—Both Protestants and Roman Catholics do.

26710. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What do you mean by "free to choose"?—That is where there is not any pecuniary attached to their exercising their own free choice. For instance, in Glenties there is a penalty attached to attending National schools, and the same is in other districts. In the Ballina district there is a penalty attached to the attendance of Roman Catholics at vested schools. I am aware of the existence of vested schools in the county Mayo, the teachers of which have not been allowed sacraments for many years, and the children attending which are refused sacraments.

26711. Rev. Mr. Cowse.—Will you mention a school by name?—Garracoon school, county Mayo. The manager is the Earl of Arran.

26712. Sir Robert Kane.—What part of Mayo is that in?—Within five statute miles of Ballina. I wish to complete my answer on that point. That is not the only school. I know several others.

26713. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Are there many other such cases?—Ballymully. The patron is Mr. Shann Carter, an English gentleman, who has property in Enis. The manager is his land agent, Mr. Cunningham, residing near Belmullet.

26714. Mr. Cowse.—Is either of them a clergyman?—No.

26715. Rev. Mr. Cowse.—Are you aware whether any special case of pecuniary could be alleged against that school?—I am aware that no such instances have been or can be alleged. The teachers in both instances are Roman Catholics, and Catholics with excellent characters from their own parish priests.

26716. Has there been any feud between the parish priest and the landlord?—No; no feud. Lord Arran is most popular with the managing body, he gives donations to other National schools on his property, where they are under the management of the Roman Catholic clergy. There has been feud between him and them. The only reason why the attendance of Roman Catholic children is prohibited at these schools is simply be-

cause the Roman Catholic bishop orders his clergy to refuse the sacraments to those who attend vested schools or schools under Protestant management. There are the two classes of schools which Roman Catholic children in the district are prohibited from attending.

26717. Sir Robert Kane.—You mentioned it was your opinion that where Roman Catholic children had the choice between attending a denominational school and a National school under Catholic management, that they preferred attending the National school. Can you give the Commissioners any actual examples within your experience of that kind?—Yes; in my present district in the town of Cahire, where there are two schools—one a denominational, the other a National school, both female schools within twenty yards of each other—the denominational school is a convent school, and has been recently put in connexion with the National Board, but during 1867 and 1868 it was not connected with the National Board. There is a National school under the management of the parish priest, within about twenty yards of that school, on the same premises. The convent school was not half filled. The National school, which afforded very poor accommodation, was overcrowded.

26718. Mr. Stokes.—Can you give the number of children in attendance in each case?—During 1867 there were 132 individual pupils on the rolls of the female National school, during the same year I cannot say what the attendance at the other school was, because it was not connected with the Board. It has recently been connected with the Board, and I found 270 pupils in it. These 270 pupils did not half fill the school, whereas the attendance in the National school overcrowded it.

26719. Have you ever visited the two schools on the same day?—I have.

26720. Can you give the number of children you yourself found in each school on the same day?—About 270 and I found some months ago in the convent school, and I think between fifty and sixty I found in the other school.

26721. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What was the relative attendance to the capacity of accommodation?—I have frequently found the attendance much in excess of the accommodation in the National school, the circumference of the roof was only about 44 feet from the floor, the school was in the upper story of a rather untenable house. The accommodation in the school was very poor, I have often found the children sitting on the floor, because they had no seats, and because the accommodation was not sufficient.

26722. The Chairman.—Is this a National school?—Yes.

26723. Did you report that want of accommodation of seats to the Board?—I did, to the manager.

26724. Did you report it to the Board?—Yes.

26725. Would not that be sufficient reason for closing the school?—It would be sufficient reason for closing the school. The Board wrote to the manager calling upon him to improve the condition of the school, and, as he was about putting the convent school in connexion with the Board, he did not comply with this call. But there are many instances in which the Board call upon a manager to effect improvements which they consider desirable before they absolutely withdraw grants. For instance, they did withdraw grants in other cases on account of the unsuitability of the school houses.

26726. Mr. Cowse.—Who was the manager?—The Rev. Mr. Mooney, P.P. of Cahire.

26727. Is he manager of the convent school?—Yes.

26728. Sir Robert Kane.—The pressure put on the children to make them go into the convent school was by leaving the ordinary school in that bad order?—I do not draw that inference, but I have heard it drawn. I am not in a position to say what the rev. gentleman's motives were, or whether he had any particular motive.

26729. Are you aware whether he was anxious the children should go into the convent school in prefer-

Feb. 23, 1869.  
 Thomas  
 O'Hare, esq.

once to attending the school under lay teachers?—I am aware he made two applications—his first application to place it in connexion with the National Board was refused on a ground he was not satisfied regarding, and he renewed the application. In fact, when he made the first application there was a stone cross built into the wall in front of the convent school, and, this being regarded by the National Board as a denominational emblem, they refused grants to the school. He being anxious to put his school in connexion with the Board, he compromised the matter with the Board. He got a huge wooden board, on which he painted "National School," and he let this down over the cross in front of the house, and in this way the cross was not to be seen—the cross in this way was dimmed.

26727 Mr. Gibson.—Was the cross upon the school-house?—The cross was a stone cross in front of the school house on the wall, built in the wall, projecting about six inch from the surface of it. The Board refused a grant to the school on the ground that there was a denominational emblem in front of the school. The manager being anxious to put the school in connexion with the Board, adopted the only expedient possible, unless he pulled down the house—he had a board painted with National school on it, and let it over the cross. I should also mention that the old school—the National school, without twenty yards of this school—has a cross upon it—not built into the wall, but standing over the house, on the top of the gable. There were crosses in both instances. The cross of the convent school was built into the front of the wall, and easily visible to a person who would look out for it. The cross in the other case was built on the gable of the school, which had been originally a school in connexion with the Kilbare-place Society.

26728 Mr. Stokes.—The Board objected to the cross in the one case, and not in the other?—The Board permitted it in one case, where it was very conspicuous, and objected to it in the other, where it was not. There was great dissatisfaction amongst the people, who objected to placing the school in connexion with the Board on such principles. The people of Galway were dissatisfied with this. They thought the conduct of the Board in the one case was equal to an insult or an indignity to the convent school.

26729 Has the teacher of the ordinary National school been a long time in the place?—For several years, before I had charge of the district.

26730 Is the school a male or a female school?—There were two schools, a male and a female. The cross surmounting the gable stands there. The schools were originally built in connexion with the Kilbare-place Society, who gave a grant. Then the Kilbare-place Society ceasing operations, they put these schools in connexion with the Board, and the cross remained on the school. The male school was in the under story, and the female school on the upper story.

26731 Are there two schools there?—No; the house became so inferior that the male school was allowed to die out. Another National school is established in the town.

26732 Mr. Gibson.—Was the fact of the cross being on the front of the new school mentioned in the Inspector's report when the school was taken into connexion?—I am not aware, but I presume it was not, for so far as I can understand the Board's rules did not prohibit it at that time.

26733 Lord Clarendon.—Can you say whether the cross was on the school when it was in connexion with the Kilbare-place Society?—So I am informed.

26734 Therefore it was no offence to the Kilbare-place Society?—No offence, for it appears to be fixed into the building.

26735 But it was an offence to the Board of National Education, and the school was neglected?—That was not the cause of the neglect. The Commissioners of National Education found the cross there,

and did not mind it, but in the case of the new school having a cross not so conspicuous the Board objected.

26736 It was an offence in the eyes of the Commissioners of National Education, but it had not been an offence to the Kilbare-place Society—is that so?—That is the obvious inference.

26737 Mr. Gibson.—You are aware that the National Board, as a rule, object to all denominational emblems on the exterior or interior of schools?—Yes; I am aware of that rule. When the Kilbare-place Society placed the cross on their school I presume they did not regard it as a denominational emblem. It was not reported on the case, but I presume there was no necessity for bringing it under the notice of the Board, inasmuch as, so far as I am informed, there was then no rule of the Board prohibiting the exhibition of a denominational emblem on the school.

26738 At what time?—When the Board's operations commenced at first.

26739 It was sometime after their operations commenced the Board made the rule in question?—So I am informed.

26740 Mr. Stokes.—Did you ever observe the cross built into the walls of the Bagginistown schools here in Dublin?—I have not observed it. I do not know where the schools are.

26741 Sir Robert Kane.—Do you not consider the cross may be regarded as an emblem common to every form of Christianity, and above the means of denominational emblems, and that, therefore, it may be fairly exempted from the rule of the Board?—That is my opinion. I presume that was the opinion of the Kilbare-place Society, which consisted mainly of Protestants—at least the administrative part of it—when they allowed a cross over the Galway schools.

26742 Mr. Gibson.—Was it allowed because the schools would be more likely to be frequented by Catholics from their having a cross upon them, than if there was no cross?—If that was the reason, on which the Kilbare-place Society acted they were more tolerant than the National Board are. A further the National Board should not upon that principle as there was more likelihood of Catholics attending the National school, than a Kilbare-place Society school.

26743 Is that your opinion?—Yes.

26744 Sir Robert Kane.—These children were obliged to enter the school by the exhibition of that emblem, but their treatment in school might be different under the Kilbare-place Society, from what it would be under the National Board?—Yes, in the treatment of children the National Board respects conscience, the Kilbare-place Society did not.

26745 Mr. Gibson.—Are you aware that in Ireland the cross is almost exclusively appropriated to Catholics?—I am not aware it is almost exclusively.

26746 Not so much now as it was some years ago. At the time the National Board commenced operations in 1833, was it not considered almost exclusively Catholic?—I do not think it was ever considered an exclusively Roman Catholic emblem in Ireland, so far as I can form an opinion, it never was in Ireland, not in any other country. In going through England I have frequently seen the cross in Protestant Churches. I have seen crosses on Protestant Churches in Ireland also.

26747 You will see it in Scotland on Presbyterian places of worship?—I have not been in Scotland. In England and Ireland I have seen crosses on Protestant Churches, therefore, I presume that in England and Ireland the cross is not considered a denominational emblem.

26748 Sir Robert Kane.—What is your experience with regard to the attendance of children in the town schools—for instance in the town of Clonmel, with which you are familiar—with regard to the attendance of children in the National schools as compared with the attendance in denominational schools—are there any schools of Christian Brothers in Clonmel?—There are two schools of Christian Brothers, and two convent schools, none of which are connected with the National Board.



26749 Are they largely attended?—I have never been in any of them, but so far as I can judge from what I hear, they are largely attended by Roman Catholics.

26750 Do you find any indisposition on the part of Roman Catholic children to attend the National schools there?—I do not. I believe the Roman Catholic children in Clonmel would, if permitted, attend the model school in preference to any school. They are prevented from attending by the refusal of sacraments. In fact it is only the refusal of sacraments on drive children out of model schools.

26751 Putting aside for the present the model school, are there in Clonmel any ordinary National schools?—None in the town. In the vicinity of Clonmel, some miles out, there are National schools. I am aware there are attended by Roman Catholics who have left the Christian Brothers' schools, and have gone a distance to attend the National schools. I am aware of one school, four statute miles from Clonmel, in which the teacher the other day told me he had twenty-five pupils who left the Christian Brothers' schools in Clonmel and came to him, as soon as his school was established. It was a newly established school, under the parish priest. When an inspector is reporting on an application for having a new school placed in connection with the Board, a query to be answered is—How far is the attendance likely to be drawn from other existing schools? In getting that information, I was informed by the teacher that twenty-five of his pupils were drawn from the Christian Brothers' schools in Clonmel.

26752 These were children whose parents voluntarily preferred sending them to the National school, under the management of the parish priest, than to the Christian Brothers' school?—Yes, they were all Roman Catholics.

26753 Was that on account of any greater degree of convenience or proximity in the school?—No. The teacher told me several of the boys came from the very suburbs of the town. Some came from miles. In Quirk-on-Suir I have met children from the National school, some three miles from the town, who came from the vicinity of the town to attend National schools.

26754 They left the town where there were Christian Brothers' schools to attend National schools?—Yes, leaving the vicinity of the town.

26755 Mr. Stokes—Had these boys been expelled from the Christian Brothers' school before they went to the National school?—I could not say that. I never heard of any boy being expelled. Where they left the Christian Brothers' school, the reason given was, where I inquired, that they were not well taught.

26756 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Have you any reason to suppose they were expelled?—I have not. In fact my opinion is that they were not expelled. If they had been expelled it would come under my notice.

26757 Lord Clonbrock—Did you inquire was the teaching level at the National schools than at the Christian Brothers' schools?—That was the reason the children sought for leaving the Christian Brothers' schools.

26758 Was the master of the National school better than the average?—I know five such schools, one of which is under a very good teacher, and the others under ordinary third class teachers. These schools are in the vicinity of Clonmel and Quirk-on-Suir.

26759 Were all these schools attended by pupils who had been at the Christian Brothers' schools?—Yes; I know five instances of National schools being attended by pupils who left Christian Brothers' schools and came to them.

26760 Mr. Stokes—Were the Brothers' schools very full?—I have never been in them.

26761 Are they not attended by very poor children in great numbers?—By all classes in Clonmel. The better classes not being allowed at National schools, and having no other schools, they must go to the Christian Brothers' schools.

26762 But still is there not a large number of poor ill-dressed boys in the Christian Brothers' schools?—They are educated gratuitously, and I presume that is the reason they partake more of the character of ragged schools.

26763 Would you be surprised to find children of the more respectable class going to the National schools from a determination to associate with ragged children?—I would not be surprised if they were to go on that account. I am aware from conversation with parents they would prefer National schools if permitted to avail themselves of them, because of the superiority of education given in them.

26764 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Would not the same principle apply to model schools where children of respectable classes are sent to attend with poor children also?—Yes.

26765 Mr. Stokes—Did you ever see a model school which you could describe as a ragged school?—I have seen model schools with what you would call ragged children just as in Christian Brothers' schools.

26766 What proportion would these ragged children bear to the other children in the National school?—A small proportion. So far as I can form an opinion, the Roman Catholic parents of children, whether ragged or respectable, are refused the sacraments for allowing their children to attend there.

26767 Rev. Dr. Wilson—Do the Christian Brothers' schools in Clonmel answer the description of ragged schools?—They do not. These are ragged children at them and respectable children. In fact, so far as the attendance is concerned, it is of the same character as at the model school.

26768 Master Brooks—Have they the same accommodation in proportion to the number?—I have never been in them, but from the appearance of the houses they appear to have much larger accommodation than the National school. Clonmel National school is remarkable for the inferiority of accommodation. It was the first established model school in Ireland, and being the first, the architecture was not so good as it has been in the schools erected since, and it does not afford so much accommodation.

26769 Can you say why the attendance at the Brothers' is much larger than the attendance at the model school?—I believe it is because children are prevented from attending the model school.

26770 Sir Robert Keane—Is the model school still attended by any number of Roman Catholic children?—Yes, about one-fourth of the children are still Roman Catholics. I forward a report to the Education Office every week, stating the numbers of different denominations. My impression is that about one-fourth of the attendance is still Roman Catholic.

26771 What number may that one-fourth amount to?—I think about forty. That is on rolls. I believe the average daily attendance at present is about 120 or 130 in the three departments of the model school. I should say there are about 150 on the rolls, I think about one-fourth of these are Roman Catholics.

26772 The average attendance is over one hundred?—Yes, over 110, I believe.

26773 So that there would be an average attendance of about twenty-five Roman Catholics?—Yes, about that, or somewhat more.

26774 Mr. Stokes—Can you give the proportions of the general population?—I cannot give the numerical proportion, but of course the Roman Catholics are in a vast majority in Clonmel.

26775 Lord Clonbrock—Is the attendance of Roman Catholics very much less now than it was a few years ago?—I have been in Clonmel only since May, 1867. The proportion of Roman Catholics remains pretty stationary since that time.

26776 You are not aware what it was three or four years ago?—Before the prohibition the Roman Catholics were in the majority at the school, so I have heard.

26777 Mr. Stokes—On the day we visited the Clonmel model school there were twenty-four Roman Catholic children in attendance out of 132. Would

Feb 22 1868  
Thomas  
O'Brien 791

Feb. 23, 1869,  
Thomas  
O'Hara, esq.

that be the ordinary proportion do you think?—I think that is under the ordinary proportion.

26778. Still that corresponds pretty nearly with the number just stated as attending, about 18 per cent.—Yes, I don't pretend to give these as the exact numbers. That is my impression.

26779. Sir Robert Kane—Are the children subject to ecclesiastical penalties for attending the model school?—Yes, they are; their parents are refused Sacraments.

26780. Is it merely that they have been threatened, or are they actually deprived of them?—They are actually deprived of Sacraments. The teachers are allowed no Sacraments except marriage. There is a dispensation granted, I believe, in case of marriage, not in the case of any other Sacrament. Teachers have not been at Sacraments for some years—the Roman Catholic teachers. Generally speaking the attendance of Roman Catholic children varies coming on the time when confessions are being heard, twice a year, in Lent and before Christmas, the attendance of Roman Catholic children falls short. After the confessions are over, the attendance of Roman Catholic children generally increases. Roman Catholics, in going to confession, in order to insure being allowed the Sacraments, withdraw their children from the schools.

26781. Mr. Stokes—Have you ever known the same thing to happen with regard to drunkenness? You say the number of Roman Catholic children in attendance at the model school increases according to the time of confession passes away?—Yes.

26782. Have you made the same observation with regard to drunkenness—whether it is not less prevalent in Advent and Easter time than in other seasons of the year?—I have not been in a position to take statistics of drunkenness, but I have been in a position to take statistics of attendance at the schools, so I cannot make any comment.

26783. Sir Robert Kane—Do you wish to convey to the Commissioners, as the result of your observations, that those ecclesiastical penalties are, to a certain extent, created by the children leaving the school *pro forma* for a season, and then, when they attend to their religious duties, and participate in the sacraments, they afterwards return to the school?—I am informed that that is the case. That is the way in which the fluctuations in the attendance are accounted for.

26784. From your observation and knowledge of the population, do you consider that those families who are refused the sacraments of the Church in consequence of the attendance of the children at the model schools that they are in any way immoral and disreputable, or worse conducted than other portions of the population?—I am aware they are not, so far as I can form an opinion. Many respectable people have expressed to me their regret that they were not able to avail themselves of the advantages offered by the school. I am not aware that immorality or inferiority of character is in any way an element in the case.

26785. Has the proportion of Roman Catholics in attendance on the model schools diminished itself since these penalties were first inflicted, or has there been any progressive diminution in the attendance?—I can only speak confidently since May, 1867. Since then there has been no progressive diminution. The proportions are pretty stationary since then.

26786. Then you do not consider the disabilities have been more effective lately than in the first instance?—I do not. I believe they were more effective in the very first, and are still effective, as they were at first, in preventing the great body of Roman Catholics from attending. They were effective at first, and are so still.

26787. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Can you say the parents of the children who were prevented from attending consider that they labour under any grievance—that they regard it as a hardship?—Yes. I have frequently had conversations with those interested in the education of the town, and they consider it a very great grievance.

26788. In what way?—That they were prevented

from availing themselves of the better education. I have even heard Roman Catholic clergymen talking of it as a grievance. For instance, I have heard Roman Catholic clergymen talking of it as a grievance, that they themselves are prohibited from having trained teachers in the schools. In the bishop's college or diocesan seminary in Waterford there are two young men employed who were trained in the Glanad school as pupil-teachers, and afterwards in the central model school.

26789. From that would you infer that the opposition is not so much to the training under the National Board as to connexion with the National system?—I presume it is not to the training of the National Board. If the training in the model schools was considered objectionable, the two young men trained in the Glanad Model school, and afterwards in the schools of the Board in Dublin, would not I presume be selected as lay instructors of the future Roman Catholic clergy of the diocese of Waterford.

26790. Sir Robert Kane—Do you mean to convey that the Roman Catholic clergy do not in reality consider that the persons trained in the model schools are necessarily immoral or unfit to act as teachers in the country, or is it that they object to using them in consequence of their not having themselves in any efficient influence in the administration of the system?—They object to employ them simply because the bishop prohibits them from employing them. I believe they have no other ground of objection to them. I have heard clergymen remark that they consider themselves treated badly in being prohibited by the bishop from permitting the employment of trained teachers when he permitted their employment in his own diocesan seminary in Waterford. I am aware also of Roman Catholic teachers going up to be trained from under Roman Catholic managers, that when they returned from training, the managers, by episcopal orders, refused to take them back, but they went away, and were employed by other Roman Catholic managers. This was evading the regulations. The Roman Catholic clergymen who employed them, of course, did not wish it to be known they did so employ them.

26791. Lord Clarendon—Is it your opinion the parents look upon the episcopal prohibition as a hardship?—Such is my opinion. I know one instance of a Roman Catholic clergyman who has been compelled to disavow teachers he had in his employment a couple of years subsequent to their being trained. In Kesh, the parish priest was compelled to put with teachers, one of whom had been trained in 1865, and whom he retained up to the beginning of the present year. He parted with her simply because if he had not, he would have the alternative of suspension.

26792. Rev. Dr. Wilson—Are we to understand this teacher was taken back again into the employment of the manager?—After returning from training he was allowed to manage her school as well as any other teacher by the manager.

26793. Sir Robert Kane—Are you acquainted with a document addressed to the National Board by Mr. Clieker Porter, Chief Secretary for Ireland, on the subject of the organisation of training schools?—I don't think I have read the document. I have heard of the document, and I have considered the subject of the training of pupil-teachers.

26794. From your experience in regard to the management of these model schools, do you think Mr. Porter's arrangement would be an improvement upon the existing system?—I am not familiar enough with the views put forward in Mr. Porter's letter so as to contrast them with the views that regulate the training of teachers at present in model schools.

26795. One of the principal objects of Mr. Porter's plan is to get rid of the system of boarding the pupil-teachers in the model schools, and to enable those persons to live in homes under the control and supervision of persons of their own religious denomination—do you think such a system of domestic

denominational residences would be preferable to the system of boarding which now exists for pupil-teachers?—I can hardly say that I am not satisfied that the present system is conducive to the success of National education. My own impression is that the pupil-teachers should not be boarded at all, either on denominational or mixed principles. I think they should be compelled to board themselves. I believe there is a great expenditure in boarding them, and that the advantages to the Board do not correspond to the cost. In the Clarendon model school since its establishment there were 113 pupil-teachers boarded and educated, and only about one-fourth of these are now known to be in the service of the Board. On the other hand there were sixty-two monitorial who were not boarded, and one-third of these are known to be in the service of the Board. So that practically it comes to this, that a smaller proportion of those who are boarded at the public expense remain in the service than of those who were not boarded at the public expense. On that ground I think the system of boarding pupil-teachers or monitorial is not at all conducive to the interests of the Board. I think it is more expensive and less calculated to meet the ends in view. I believe the temptation of getting a free education induces a great many young persons to offer themselves for admission into the schools without the intention of taking to the teaching profession, whereas monitorial have not that inducement to offer themselves for admission.

26776 Mr. Stokes.—The difference of sex has been cited as an explanation of the difference you allude to, what answer would you give to that observation?—I don't think that explains it, because in the other National schools I find that of those who go through the monitorial training, and who are not boarded in those schools, there is a larger number remaining in the service as teachers than of those who were boarded in model schools.

26777. Does that observation include the boys as well as the girls?—Yes, my belief is that so far as both monitorial and monitorial, there is a larger proportion of those who were not boarded remaining in the service than of those who were boarded. I know that some candidates get admission into the model schools as pupil-teachers who had no intention whatever of becoming teachers. They, for the time being, represented themselves as desirous to become pupil-teachers, and after having been boarded and lodged for a couple of years at the public expense, they took to other occupations. They had no other intention from the first. I consider that, therefore, an injudicious mode of recruiting the teaching service.

26778 Sir Robert Kane.—You think there are rather too great inducements held out to young men to propose to become teachers in the first instance, and that having qualified themselves in some degree for various employments they adopt some other line of life which is more remunerative?—Yes, and I believe that if they were paid something more as monitorial than at present, and not boarded and lodged, a great many would become monitorial with the less able intention of remaining as teachers. I consider the training of a monitorial superior to that of a pupil-teacher. A monitorial remains five years under training, and the pupil-teacher only from one to two years. I consider the monitorial training the more effective and the cheaper of the two, and the more calculated to induce persons to remain in the service.

26779 Sir Mr. Cooke.—How long have you been Inspector of schools?—Six years in April next.

26780 Were you always in the same part of the country?—I have been in Roscommon and Ballina, and in Clarendon.

26781 Are there model schools in the first district?—None in the first or second.

26782 Sir Robert Kane.—I think I heard you were connected with agricultural education in the north of Ireland?—Yes, I had the management of the Templemore Agricultural Seminary for three years, and I

was subsequently editor of the *Agricultural Review* when I was appointed Inspector of schools.

26783 Are there any agricultural schools in the Clarendon district?—Several. One a model school and four ordinary agricultural schools.

26784 You have not been specially connected with the management of an agricultural school under the Board?—Templemore Agricultural School was partly under the Board and partly under the management of the London Companies, it has ceased to exist.

26785 With respect to the mode of paying schoolmasters, there is adopted in England a system known as payment by results, according to the standard attained by the children at certain examinations, have you ever considered how far that would be an improvement upon the system of payment at present in force?—Yes, that is a subject to which I have given particular attention; my impression is there could be no step taken so conducive to the promotion of education in this country as the introduction of the principle of payment by results, not entirely as it is in England, but with some modifications adapted to the circumstances of this country.

26786 Mr. O'Brien.—What is your opinion as to the manner in which the classification of trained teachers is conducted in model schools?—I have been comparing the efficiency of trained and untrained teachers, and so far as I can form an opinion there is very little difference; I find some very efficient untrained teachers, and very inefficient trained teachers. I think the system might be made more effective if there was a better curriculum adopted in training establishments.

26787 Do you find any teachers in your district have received a higher grade of classification than what their efficiency, so far as you can judge from the schools, would entitle them to?—I cannot say that, as a consequence of going to training, they get a higher class than what they would get if they remained in the country, and underwent the ordinary examination by the Inspector. But I can say there are a great many in receipt of salaries by virtue of classification, which they have no claim to in virtue of their services.

26788 What do you mean by "their services"?—Their efficiency as teachers; I will take a case. Suppose two schools, one with an average attendance of fifty, and another with an average attendance of twenty-five, under a third-class male teacher, each of the two schools may be equally well taught, that is, each of the fifty children may be as well taught in one school, and each of the twenty-five in the other school, and the teacher who had charge of the fifty will receive no more salary than the teacher having charge of the twenty-five. The teacher having the fifty children, his instruction has been much more effective on the fifty than that of the other teacher on the twenty-five; but, under the present system of paying teachers, each teacher will receive the same sum—each will receive £24 a year from the Board—although the one man educates with equal efficiency twice as many as the other.

26789 Does that depend upon the greater knowledge one man possesses over the other, or does it depend upon his superior knowledge of school management, or on what else does it depend?—It depends partly upon his greater knowledge of school management, and partly that greater earnestness, greater energy is employed in instruction. There may be two men having the same class under the National Board. But as classification is based mainly on examination, and no examination can detect more than their relative working power, the teaching of the one may be much more efficient than that of the other. The present mode of paying teachers does not take notice of this—to a certain extent it should.

26790 Would you say those men might be possessed of equal qualifications?—Yes; but one may be more energetic.

26791 Is it not possible that the more trained man may be a less efficient teacher than the less trained man?—Yes. I have known that. I have known

Feb. 23, 1880.  
 ———  
 Thomas  
 O'Hara, esq.

schools under the first class teachers in which very little progress was made during the year, and I have known schools under third class teachers, in which considerable progress was made during the year.

26812. What absolute standard of qualifications would you propose by which classification should be settled by the professors, or what elements should enter into it?—I think, for instance, as far as the professors in Dublin are concerned there is this defect,—that the teaching of schoolmastership is not sufficiently attended to in the training department. The professional staff there consists generally of two professors of mathematics, two professors of English, with a lecturer upon agriculture. Physical science is not attended to, and schoolmastership, so far as I can form an opinion, is not much attended to. At least there is no special professor for the subject. I would have only one professor of mathematics. The teachers could learn that in the country as well as in Dublin. There is one subject which they cannot learn as well in the country as in Dublin—that is physical science. No teacher can be effective without a moderate knowledge of physics. They can get that better in Dublin than in the country, and the curriculum here ought to comprise mathematics, physics, English, including an elementary knowledge of mechanics, reasoning, and such subjects, schoolmastership, and instruction in agriculture. The teacher of every rural school ought to have a knowledge of agriculture.

26813. What is the usual period of teaching?—From four and a half to five months.

26814. Do you think that sufficient to enable a man to come up from a country school and to acquire a competent knowledge of the branches you have mentioned?—I think the time is quite inadequate. I think the time ought to be nine or ten months. It ought to be for the whole year, with the exception of the ordinary vacations.

26815. Taking any given number of marks to represent the entire amount of qualifications, what number would you give to these different branches to a third-class teacher? Suppose the entire qualifications were represented by 500 or 1,000, what number of marks should be assigned for each of these subjects, giving the maximum and minimum of each?—On a total of, say 600 marks, I would give the English group 300 marks; the mathematical group 100; the physical group, 100; schoolmastership 100.

26816. That is the highest number of marks. What would be your minimum?—50 per cent in any of those subjects.

26817. Fifty would be a great difference?—Yes, *ceteris paribus* it would. That is supposing skill in teaching corresponded with the marks obtained on examination. But it does not always happen that tact and energy are proportioned to the qualifications, as thus ascertained.

26818. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—You have said you were formerly stationed in Ballina as the centre of a district?—Yes.

26819. What is your opinion of the teachers of National schools in that district, as to qualifications, schoolmastership, and so on?—The qualifications are exceedingly low—so low that I think about one half of them ought not to be in the public service at all as teachers.

26820. Can you account for that?—Yes. There are several ways of accounting for it. One cause is the low curriculum of the Board, the low standard of qualification adopted by the Board for probationers and lower-class teachers. Another cause is the small local support given to schools. Another cause is the prohibition against training, which prevents teachers from improving themselves—improving their classification as they ought. Another cause is, I believe—and that is common to most districts along with Ballina—the multiplication of schools beyond the requirements of the service. I hold there are too many schools.

26821. Does your observation apply both to Ballina

and Clonsilla?—To both, but to a much greater extent to Ballina than to Clonsilla. It applies in common with Ballina, to all other districts in the west and northwest of Ireland. In Ballina the teachers are driven to the temptations of falsifying school accounts to entitle them to their salaries. That is common to Ballina district, and to the north and northwest of Ireland.

26822. Is that a state of things which should be rectified?—Yes.

26823. In what way?—I think the Board should not give a grant to any school having a lower average than thirty. I find the best schools are those in which the attendance is large enough to justify the appointment of a principal teacher and monitor. I find that small schools are generally bad schools. When the schools become very small, the better class of men will not take them, inferior candidates offer themselves, and these inferior candidates are appointed. To enable even them to keep up an attendance sufficient to entitle them to their salaries they conspire with each other to withdraw the attendance from each other's schools. They undertake each other for pupils. The worst teachers are those who go to the greatest extent in this underhanded neighbouring teachers.

26824. Were any of these schools opened since you went to Ballina?—Yes.

26825. And several previously?—Yes.

26826. Should you be able to assign any cause for the multiplication of these schools?—One cause is the decomposition of the gentry, and another cause is the desire of persons to take to the business of teaching, rather than to a more laborious business. I have known schools to be got up by persons who wished to become teachers—they got them up at their own expense by either building or renting the houses. They were themselves then appointed. An application was made by the parish priest, who is generally the manager, to have the school put in connection with the Board. The Inspector goes and reports upon the case—sometimes he reports against the school being taken into connection—and sometimes, having regard to the Board's rules he reports that it may be taken into connection. The school is often taken into connection, although there is no particular necessity for it. A great many of these schools are private adventure schools, which get the recognition of the Board, upon making application in the usual form.

26827. Did the Commissioners pay attention to the Inspector's reports when they were against the establishment of such schools?—I can only speak of one instance of that kind. I recollect one instance in which I myself reported against a grant to a school of this class. I reported against it on these grounds:—First, that the teacher was incompetent; secondly, that it was a mere adventure school got up by the teacher who rented the house in which the school was held; thirdly, that the house was unsuitable, fourthly, that there was no particular necessity for the school at all in the place. It was intermediate between two other National schools, which were only two and a half miles from each other, in a thinly populated rural district, and neither of which had a large attendance.

26828. Rev. Mr. Corrie.—What was the result?—The Board took the school in, notwithstanding this.

26829. Mr. Gwyn.—What was the distance of the nearest school to the applicant's school?—About a mile—less than a statute mile as the crow flies. Perhaps going by the road about a mile. It was intermediate between two schools which were about three miles asunder.

26830. How far had the children to travel?—I think some going to this school would have to go more than a mile and a half, perhaps not so much.

26831. How far would they have to go to the intermediate school?—From a mile to a mile and a half. I think about a mile and a half. None of those who were attending the other schools would have to go more than a mile and a half to either.

26832. Was that one journey?—Yes, one journey, an English mile.

26833. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Your answer applies to the state of things previous to the establishment of the new school?—Yes.

26834. Is it your experience that the managers of the National schools have taken much interest in them?—The majority have not, some have. The majority take no special interest otherwise than signing the official papers and making the applications. At least in the Ballina district, in the west of Ireland, the majority did not take much interest, a few managers did.

26835. Did they pay much attention to the secular instruction given in the schools?—I never knew an instance in which there was any attention paid to the secular instruction.

26836. Did they formally pay much attention to the religious instruction given in the schools?—I could not say there was any instance in Ballina in which there was much attention given to religious instruction, which was entirely left to the schoolmasters.

26837. Did they attend to give religious instruction in the schools?—I never knew an instance in which a manager attended to give religious instruction.

26838. To whom was left the imparting of the religious instruction given in the schools?—It was left entirely to the teachers.

26839. Does the mass apply to the Clonmel district?—I am aware a great many of the Roman Catholic clergy in the Clonmel district do attend from time to time to give religious instruction.

26840. Is religious instruction regularly imparted in all the schools in your district?—It is regularly imparted by the teachers, and occasionally by several of the managers.

26841. Are the educational wants of the Clonmel district fairly met?—They are.

26842. Is there much room for the establishment of new schools?—I believe there is only one school required in the whole district, and that school is about to be established; only one locality where a school is required now—Ballysreen. Measures are about being taken for establishing a school there.

26843. Your entire district?—Yes.

26844. What is the extent of it?—It is now about 700 square miles in area.

26845. You think at present one additional school would satisfy all the educational wants of the district?—Yes, I am satisfied it would. That is one school in addition to the applications now before the Board. There are applications not yet decided upon. One new application would suffice for all the wants of the district.

26846. In your opinion in your district there is any impediment to the acceptance and extension of National education?—There is sometimes a difficulty in getting a site in the most suitable place.

26847. But so far as the sentiments of the mass of the people of all denominations are concerned is there any such impediment?—There is no positive impediment. I am aware a great many Roman Catholics consider the National system might be improved—might be made more acceptable to them than it is at present. I don't think their sentiments might be regarded as an impediment to the system. But there are a great many Roman Catholics think that whilst the system itself is a good one, it is susceptible of considerable improvement.

26848. Should we understand you to say that even in Clonmel Protestant children prefer attending National schools, though having near them schools under Protestant managers and Protestant teachers?—I think so. The Protestant rectors of the town told me.

26849. Rev. Mr. Cusack.—Is it not the fact that the school provided in Clonmel for the Protestant population is a very bad one?—I heard it was a remarkably good one.

26850. Is it not the fact that the master has been under some difficulty, and the whole thing in abeyance

for some time past?—I heard the master was a young gentleman who was going through Trinity College, with the view of taking orders in the Established Church—that he was an exceptionally good teacher.

26851. Are you acquainted with the circumstances of the school—the Endowed School for Protestants in Clonmel?—I am talking of what is called the Church Education school.

26852. I mean the endowed school?—The endowed school can hardly be said to be in operation at all—there are only one or two pupils attending it.

26853. Then certain persons who would be entitled to the benefit of that school go to the model school, to get as good or a better education?—I mean the sons of professional people in Clonmel?—Yes, but the school I compared with the model school is the school intended to educate the same class of pupils who would attend the model school—it is the Church Education school—the teacher in which, so far as I am informed, is a young man who is being educated with the view of taking orders in the Established Church.

26854. I was not referring to that school, but is not the Church Education Society's school meant chiefly for the education of children of the poor?—So are the National schools.

26855. Is not the model school frequented chiefly by the children of persons in a middle class station—professional persons and others?—Not chiefly.

26856. To a large extent?—To a considerable extent it is.

26857. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have the circumstances of the Erasmus Smith's school, to which reference has been made, at all affected the attendance of this class of children in the Clonmel model school?—I think not. The Erasmus Smith school was intended mainly to give a classical education—one school was for primary education, the other was for intermediate education.

26858. In the case of Roman Catholic children attending the model schools in Clonmel—whose parents are deprived of the sacraments—have you reason to believe they would regard it as a great hardship if the Government or Parliament of the country would carry out the views of the bishops, as against their free school in the matter of education?—As far as the lower class of the laity are concerned they are pretty indifferent upon the subject. As far as the middle class are concerned, I believe they would prefer the mixed system to a concession to the views of the bishops.

26859. With regard to the district in which you are now stationed—are there many Protestant minorities scattered in the different parishes?—There are. I took notes of eighty-four schools out of the 103 in my district. In the eighty-four of which I took notes of the attendance there were forty-four had a mixed attendance.

26860. Should you say that the Protestant minorities in your district have a school in each parish under a Protestant teacher if they choose to attend?—In some cases they have. In other cases they have not.

26861. Is there a majority of cases in which they have not?—Yes, I only know a few cases in which they have. They have in Cloughes, Carrick-on-Sun, Cahill, and Ardhanan.

26862. Exclusive of towns do you find Protestant schools scattered through your district?—None what ever.

26863. So that should a strictly denominational system be introduced, with Roman Catholic managers, teachers and children—in the mean time those Protestant children should be left unprotected for or they must attend Roman Catholic schools?—There would be no other alternative. They should attend Roman Catholic schools or forgo all participation in the benefits of public education.

26864. What convent schools are under your inspection at present, exclusive of Clonmel?—Cahill, Rathard, and Cahill.

26865. Under whose management are those schools usually?—Cahill school is under the management of

Feb. 24 1869  
Thomas  
Wilson, esq.

Feb. 23, 1864.  
 Thomas  
 O'Shea, Esq.,

the superior of the convent; Fethard school is under the management of Dean Cartwell, the parish priest; Cahir school is under the management of the Rev. Mr. Mooney, &c.

26866 Do you find the parish priests quite satisfied with these convent schools?—Quite satisfied that they are doing their work effectively.

26867 And with the religious who conduct them, as to their management and relationship to the clergy?—So far as my own knowledge goes, I believe they are. I heard some time ago that the late Archbishop Loftus of Cashel, proposed establishing a female school under his bishopric in the town. I heard that, but I don't know it of my own personal knowledge, he is since deceased.

26868 Mr. Stokes.—You have said the model school at Clonmel is opposed by the Roman Catholic bishop?—Yes.

26869 Is it not equally opposed by the Protestant bishop?—I don't know about the Protestant bishop personally. I cannot say. I heard he was opposed to National education. The rector of Clonmel, the Rev. Mr. Brady, told me he was strongly opposed to National education.

26870 In the report of the Inspector for 1864 on five model schools, including Clonmel, it is stated, that "owing to the very energetic efforts continued by many of the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, a large number of Roman Catholic parents were constrained to withdraw their children from the model schools in 1864, and others were prevented from sending theirs." The prelates of the Established Church in the dioceses in which five of these model schools are situated, being so less adverse, the schools have double difficulties to encounter in keeping up their attendance?—Is that statement true?—I believe it is.

26871 Are you aware that the beneficed clergy of the Established Church are taxed by law and oath to maintain such in his benefice a parochial school?—I heard they are.

26872 Do they do so in the Clonmel district?—They do not do so, because they have not an attendance large enough to keep up a school. You cannot have a school without pupils.

26873 If the Protestant children in these districts are not provided with schools, would you not say the beneficed clergy should be called upon to substitute schools for them?—I can only speak from hearsay of what you state. I was under the impression that it was considered part of the duty of the Protestant incumbent of a parish to have a school. I don't know that they are bound to do that on matter of law. They would be glad to do so if they could, but throughout the greater part of the Clonmel district the number of Protestants is so small that, with the exception of towns, I don't think the Protestant clergy could maintain a school in any rural part of the district.

26874 Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Supposing there is any provision made already by law for Protestant children, would not that dispose of the objection that might be brought, to the State failing to provide schools for Protestant minorities?—I don't think it

would, for this reason. The minorities are so small that no qualified teacher will take charge of schools consisting of such infinitesimally small minorities so to speak.

26875 Are these minorities so infinitesimally small?—Well, from one to ten.

26876 Then the mixed schools contain very few Protestants?—They contain very small minorities.

26877 How many of the forty-four schools contain only one?—Only one.

26878 How many contain from two to three, up to ten?—I cannot say. From two up. My recollection is there is only one school with one Protestant. The remainder of the schools have three or four, or five, up to ten. I only speak from recollection in a general way.

26879 Are you able to tell the Commissioners whether they are children chiefly of Established Church parents, or of Presbyterian parents?—Primarily of the Established Church. I recollect only two or three instances of Presbyterians.

26880 Lord Clonbrock.—Are there many schools with as many as ten?—Not many of the forty-four. About Filtstown there are schools having more than ten.

26881 How many have more than ten?—There are two schools in Filtstown which have from twenty to thirty Protestants attending them, a male and a female school.

26882 Am I to understand all the others are under ten?—I should say from three or four, up to ten. I am taking three or four or six or seven and ten, as about the number.

26883 You spoke of an anomaly in the payment of teachers, and you instanced the case of two teachers receiving equal payments, although one instructed double the number, and probably did his work more efficiently than the other?—Yes, I have known several such instances.

26884 Would not such an anomaly as that be corrected by a system of payment on results, made supplementary to the regular payments on foot of salary?—I think it would. I think the best arrangement would be to pay the teacher something in consideration of his qualifications, say a moiety of his estimated value to the public, and let the remaining moiety depend upon the results of the school.

26885 Might not the attendance in the school be an element for consideration in a system of payment by results?—It would, for the results would embody two things—quantity and quality—the number of children educated, and the efficiency of the instruction they received.

26886 Under such a system as that, you would consider there would be a fairer payment for work done?—I consider that the educational fund of the country, so far as it is employed in the remuneration of teachers, could be much more equitably and economically distributed in this way, for there would be a reward of work, whereas, under the present system many of the hardest worked men receive in many instances less than inferior teachers receive.

WILLIAM HOMAN NEWELL, Esq., LL.D., one of the Secretaries of the Board of National Education, further examined.

26887 Mr. Sullivan.—You were Head Inspector in the South of Ireland, I think, in 1864 and 1865?—Yes.

26888 In your district there was a Killyman, in the county of Limerick?—Yes.

26889 An application was made from that school in the year 1855?—There was one made in 1854—the one to which you refer.

26890 Who was the applicant in the case?—The Right Hon. Lord Ashburton, Clonliff Castle, Killyman, county Limerick.

26891 What was the exact date of the application?—The 3rd of February, 1854, was the date of the

letter requesting aid. The form of application was sent on the 11th of March, returned to the office on the 25th of March, acknowledged by circular on the 30th of March, sent to Inspector on the same day, and received from the Inspector on the 6th of July.

26892 Who was the Inspector?—Mr. Michael Hickey. The name of the correspondent was the Rev. E. D. H. Knox, but the patron was Lord Ashburton.

26893 How long had Mr. Hickey been in the district?—I do not know.

26894 Are you not aware that he had been just transferred there?—No, but I think he was not long there.

With the  
 Inspector  
 Nowell, Esq.,  
 LL.D.

Feb. 22, 1856.

—  
 William  
 Howell, esq.,  
 M.P.

26995. Are you aware that he had a great deal of smear of work from the previous Inspector?—

26996. Upon what day do you say he was advised of the reception of the application?—The 30th of March.

26997. On what day would it reach him?—I suppose it would reach him on the 1st of April.

26998. That was Saturday before Palm Sunday?—I do not know.

26999. It reached him on the 1st of April?—Yes.

27000. When was the application made for the Ballyrgan school?—The letter requesting aid was on the 10th of May.

27001. Do you know what the date of the first visit of the Inspector was to the Killyn school?—The date of his visit set down here is the 22nd of May, 1854.

27002. Is there no visit previous to that?—None recorded.

27003. In his own reports?—This is his own report I am reading from.

27004. His report on the applicant school?—This is his report on the Killyn applicant school.

27005. His journals?—I have not his journals with me. He does not refer here to any former visit.

27006. What class of school was the Killyn school?—Would that be in the report?—Killyn—that is Mr Knox's school, the materials were stone and lime; a thatched house in good state of repair, its dimensions were thirty feet long, eighteen feet broad, and eight feet high.

27007. What was the class of the second applicant school, at Ballyrgan?—"The school-room is a part of the chapel, but it is fully separated from it by a brick partition, the materials are stone and lime, and it is thatched, the state of repair is good." That is his description. I have a fuller description of the house in another report.

27008. What was the average attendance in that Killyn school?—The average was under twenty, daily; it was nineteen and a fraction.

27009. What was the average attendance in the Ballyrgan school?—Well, no record of the attendance was kept in the Ballyrgan school, but there was a large attendance.

27010. How many did you find present at the date of your own visit?—I found fifty-five boys and forty-three girls.

27011. What was the distance between the two schools, the Killyn school and the Ballyrgan school?—Well, I speak from memory, but I think they were within what would be called "a stone's throw of one another," as they say in the country, they were very close.

27012. If the Inspector visited the Killyn school, for the first time, on the 16th or the 22nd, as you will find upon that report, that was subsequent, was it not, to the reception by the Board of the Ballyrgan application?—The 22nd of May is the record here of his visit to the Killyn school.

27013. That is subsequent to the application in the case of the Ballyrgan school, is it not?—It is, to the letter requesting aid.

27014. Therefore he had nothing whatever to say to the application of the parish priest for aid—therefore he could have nothing to do with it, so far as his visiting the place, because his visit was only at a later period?—So far as visiting the place, according to what is shown in these documents.

27015. Now, is it not the duty, according to the mind of the Board, of an Inspector, when he is desired to report upon an applicant case, to report what are the opinions of the local clergy of all persuasions?—He is bound to consult the diagrams of the respective persuasions, to state whether they have any objection to the school or not, or whether they co-operate.

27016. And does this not occur in the rule which binds him?—"And in no instance is he to forward his report upon such schools until he shall have allowed sufficient time to the local clergymen and others con-

cerned to reply to his communication, regarding the propriety or the non-propriety of the Board's entertaining the application?"—Yes; that is part of the instructions that are issued to Inspectors.

26917. He was bound, therefore, to consult, respecting the Killyn school, the Rev. Dr. Meenan, being the parish priest?—Yes; but he waited from the 30th of March to the—

26918. That is not an answer to my question; he was bound to wait, and to ascertain his opinion?—Yes.

26919. In the case of the Ballyrgan school he was bound to ascertain the opinion of the Rev. Mr. Knox?—Of them all.

26920. Now the National system was a system in which the co-operation of all the clergymen and all the landlords was to be brought in—was it not?—It was very desirable.

26921. If an Inspector found two schools within a stone's throw of each other, even closer than that, both being strictly denominational, one in the end of a chapel, and the other in a new house built by Lord Ashburn for the purpose, in which there were none but Protestants, or some persons even whom the landlord had sufficient influence to compel them to go there, and that he thought a good school would be quite desirable in the district, and that he endeavored to bring that about by bringing the parties into contact—would not that be very desirable?—Yes, I think so; but I do not think it would be within his instructions on the first application, because it would be causing unusual delay, without communicating with the Commissioners to know whether he was at liberty to do so or not.

26922. What would you call unusual delay in that case?—I think anything over a month.

26923. What was the rule at that time?—I understood the rule to be that the Inspector should report within three weeks.

26924. I asked you on the last day could you produce the circular—can you produce it now?—No.

26925. Did it ever exist?—I believe it did.

26926. Do you think that it is right to punish an Inspector for a rule, which even if it existed, he could scarcely be expected to know anything about, when the Board are unable to produce a copy of it?—I think it is not fair to punish a man for that alone; but that case of punishment was not assigned in the order inflicting the penalty. It does not enter into the terms of the order.

26927. What was the order?—Here is the original order:—

"The 25th of January, 1855.

"Inform Mr. Hickey that the Board consider his explanation of the circumstances under which he took upon himself the responsibility of delaying his report upon the Killyn applicant case altogether unsatisfactory, and that his conduct was highly reprehensible, and calculated to subject him to the suspicion of having acted from improper motives. The Commissioners therefore consider it their duty to express their strong disapprobation of the course he pursued, and to inflict a fine of £15, which will be deducted from his salary for the month of February."

26928. Now what was it that he took upon himself to do in that particular case which is reprehensible?—He states it here in a very long letter which I have not read for fourteen years.

26929. The Chairman—Was it his duty to report to the Commissioners the result of his visit to Killyn on the 22nd of May?—It was his duty to have reported on the school long before the 22nd of May.

26930. Had he in point of fact reported before the 22nd of May?—I think not, my lord; we have no evidence.

26931. When did his report reach the Commissioners?—The 6th of July.

26932. Was that the report for which he incurred that displeasure for undue delay?—It was.

26933. Lord Clarendon—Would not this negotiation in which he was engaged in order to bring those two schools together, and so carry out that system of mixed education, which the Board desired,

JULY 25, 1865. have been taken as a sort of excuse for any delay?—The Commissioners thought not.

25934 Mr. Sullivan.—Was that in consequence of your report?—I do not know. The facts were laid before them. I cannot say exactly what influenced the Commissioners.

25935 Will you please read the letter?—[Letter handed to witness, which he reads.]

\* Bathkeale, December 22nd, 1864.

"GENTLEMEN,—With reference to your letter of the 16th instant, respecting the late Killynny school, I take leave to state for the information of the Commissioners the circumstances of this case, so far as I am concerned, up to the time of Mr. Newell's report.

"On the 31st of March last, the usual instructions on this application were sent to me. I was then engaged in visiting the schools left in error by my predecessor in this district, having received special instructions to attend to that day before visiting the other schools. This occupied me a considerable portion of the time current term, and as the special written communications of the main schools were to take place in Easter week, I deemed it my duty to visit all the main schools of the district if possible, before the time of summoning the teachers, for the obviously necessary purpose of deterring whom I should reason. It will be remembered that this was my first term in this district. I was hardly able to accomplish the important object when the Easter vacation, the written examinations of the teachers, and the setting of the written answers ceased. I was then engaged in the discharge of indispensable duties up to some days advanced in May.

"I take leave to remark here that I never deemed it urgently required to attend immediately to applicant cases. I always felt that it was desirable to allow reasonable time for the development of the educational requirements of the locality for which the application might be made. However, for my views on this point correct or otherwise, on the 16th of May I visited Killynny for the purpose of reporting on this application. Having examined the Church National school on that morning, in which there were present 137 pupils, and having also examined a candidate teacher afterwards, I did not arrive at the Killynny school until about 3 o'clock, when I found the pupils dismissed. I then called upon Mr. Knox, who accompanied me to the school and sent for the teacher. It then appeared that only sixteen pupils attended on that day, and that the average attendance for February, March, and April, was twenty. In the course of conversation Mr. Knox complained very much of the observations, which he stated he met with on his attendance to establish a National school, and I found him very unsparing in his instructions. He stated that there was an intense amount of Roman Catholic influence in the Board, and that a Protestant had no chance of fair play, with any other unreasonable objection to the working of the system. From all this I perceived that I had gone right of the strictest caution, and that being a Roman Catholic, my acts were liable to be greatly misunderstood, if not misrepresented.

"I felt on that occasion that Mr. Knox had not merits, as to his school, to entitle him to a grant, for he acknowledged that the attendance, such as it stood, was maintained only by great exertions, and that he had no hope of keeping up even an average attendance of twenty. As I found a large attendance of children in the chapel school opposite, I suggested that if Lord Ashburn permitted the appointment of a Roman Catholic assistant teacher or paid monitor, the point might be brought to pass his school with the Killynny school. Mr. Knox told me that he thought Lord and Lady Ashburn would never consent, as it would be like having a spy placed there to watch their actions. At the conclusion of my interview I told Mr. Knox that I deemed it necessary to visit the school again during school hours, in order to see the pupils in attendance. He told me then that he would mention my suggestions to Lord Ashburn, respecting the Roman Catholic assistant, or paid monitor.

"I again visited Killynny on the 22nd May, for the purpose of my report, which I received from Mr. Knox the note from Lord Ashburn hereunto sent, and marked No. 1. As was obviously on duty, I submitted this letter to the Rev. Dr. Meekins, &c., and I asked him would he give his school with the Killynny school, and co-operate in having an official National school opened on in the neighbourhood, upon the terms proposed by Lord Ashburn. He said he was not then able to decide how to act. That he wished to be guided by the advice of his bishop, and asked me could I defer my report on Mr. Knox's application, until he should have an opportunity of consulting his bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Keen. I consented to his request, and left with him Lord Ashburn's letter for the purpose of submitting it to Dr. Ryan.

"The mutilated note, No. 2, dated on the 25th of May, which has fortunately been preserved, clearly and fully shows the reason I did not send forward the report at once.

"The note No. 3, dated 3rd June, 1864, shows when Lord Ashburn's letter was received, and the result of my endeavours to arrange the wide difference which exist between the parties at Killynny and Ballinacorney.

"On the 2nd June, the papers respecting the Ballinacorney applicant school were sent to me, and feeling very great difficulty in being placed between two violently contending parties I wrote to Mr. Newell, and requested him to endeavour to meet me in the locality and give me his assistance in the matter; and after some correspondence he arranged to meet me and the other parties at the school, on the 26th of June.

"Believing that the above statement with the documents to which I have referred, fully shows that I have made no unnecessary or improper delay in visiting Killynny school in the first instance, or in making my report subsequently, I consider I might stop here; but in order to give the fullest satisfaction possible, I send the note No. 4, received due week from Mr. Meekins.

"I remain, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

"MICHAEL HICKLEY, District Inspector.

"The Secretaries."

25936 What was the order of the Board upon that?—There is this order upon the letter, "Send this letter to Mr. Newell, Head Inspector, and direct he will state if he considers Mr. Hickley's explanations strictly accurate, and in all respects satisfactory.

25937 What was your report upon his explanation?—On the 20th of January, 1865, I wrote—

"20th January, 1865

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your letter of yesterday's date, calling upon me to state whether or not I consider the explanation, contained in Mr. Hickley's letter of the 23rd ultimo, of the statement made by me in my special letter of the 14th June last, strictly accurate and in all respects satisfactory, I beg to say that I have ever felt reluctant to discredit the assertion of a gentleman placed in so very responsible a position as that held by Mr. Hickley, and therefore I do not say that his explanation is not 'strictly accurate'.

"If being 'satisfactory' means satisfactory to the Commissioners of National Education, I beg to say that I am of opinion it should not be considered a satisfactory explanation.

"When Mr. Hickley received orders to report upon the Killynny applicant school, there was no application pending for aid to a school at Ballinacorney, under the patronage of Dr. Meekins. In not visiting the Killynny school at an earlier date Mr. Hickley neglected to attend to a circular which respects District Inspectors to visit all applicant schools before the end of the month subsequent to that in which the application and blank form of report shall be transmitted. I cannot say upon what grounds Mr. Hickley claims the right of holding over his report upon an applicant school, in order (to use his own words) that "a development of the educational requirements of the locality" may take place. Dr. Meekins directs that he, by letter, induce Mr. Hickley to go out of his way in the discharge of his duty, as an officer of the Board of National Education. I at least, never indicated that Dr. Meekins made any such attempt either by letter or in conversation, and from the very absence of interference on the part of Dr. Meekins, one may fairly ask why did not Mr. Hickley report at once on the Killynny applicant school, and let the application be decided on its own merits? As an officer of the Board it was not, in my opinion, his business to offer any suggestion about a school whose very name was then unknown to the Commissioners of National Education. Had there at the time of his visit been two applications from the locality before the Commissioners, the course pursued by Mr. Hickley, if properly pursued, should I think have met with the approval of the Board, but Dr. Meekins's application was not. I believe, made until after he had received Lord Ashburn's note from Mr. Hickley, and brought it before the Roman Catholic bishop, and a number of his clergy assembled at Bress.

"Mr. Knox's prejudices, great and unkindred as they are, are not likely to be lessened by Mr. Hickley's conduct in the case of the Killynny applicant school. I told Mr. Hickley, when he asked my opinion in June last, that had I been in his position I would have reported at once on the Killynny school, and I submit that I thought he had not acted judiciously. Subsequent events have convinced me that Mr. Hickley's conduct was not judicious.

"It is for the Commissioners of National Education to say if it was official.

"I have the honour to be your very obedient servant,

"W. H. NISSEN, Head-Inspector.

"The Secretaries."



36938. On what day was the Ballyroan application made?—The letter requesting aid was the 10th of May, the application was returned to the office on the 25th of May; but the Inspector received no notification of it until the 2nd of June.

36939. On the 10th of May?—That was the letter requesting aid.

36940. Then, according to Mr. Hickey's own statement, he did not visit Killyn, for the first time, until the 16th, and you have no record until the 22nd?—There is no evidence here that Mr. Hickey knew anything whatever about the application from Ballyroan, as he received no official communication about it until the 2nd of June; that is, he received no official communication.

36941. The Chairman.—Could he have visited Killyn school without seeing the rival school at Ballyroan?—I think not.

36942. Mr. Sullivan.—The question that I want to ask you is this—do you, now knowing that the application was made by Dr. Meenan, on the 10th of May, say that Mr. Hickey could not have any information of that application whatever—he did not visit the place till the 16th, according to his own report, and according to the evidence before you on the 22nd?—I see it stated here distinctly that he had no official information till the 2nd of June, so that he could not have heard of it till the 3rd of June.

36943. Mr. Walker.—Officially?—Yes; I am only dealing with official information.

36944. Mr. Sullivan.—Do you know the date of Lord Ashdown's note that is referred to in your report?—The note requesting aid for Killyn was dated the 3rd of February, 1854.

36945. The Chairman.—When did Mr. Hickey communicate Lord Ashdown's note to Dr. Meenan?—Mr. Hickey states that himself, I believe, I did not state that he communicated it.

36946. But, did Mr. Hickey communicate Lord Ashdown's note to the priest after his visit to Killyn?—I could not say, of my own knowledge, that he communicated it; I will read you what he says from his letter.

36947. If you please?—

"Note, No. 3, dated, 3rd of June, 1854, shows when Lord Ashdown's letter was received, and the result of my endeavours to arrange the whole difference which existed between the parties at Killyn and Ballyroan."

36948. Look to the letter of Mr. Hickey and see if it shows when he gave Lord Ashdown's note to the priest?—Reads.

"I again visited Killyn, on the 22nd of May, for the purpose of my report, when I received from Mr. Knox a note from Lord Ashdown, herewith sent, and marked No. 1. It was obviously my duty I submitted this letter to the Rev. Dr. Meenan."

It does not say when, but, I suppose, immediately after.

36949. Had not Dr. Meenan's application for Ballyroan been sent to the Commissioners on the 10th of May?—His letter requesting aid had, but the Inspector knew nothing of it until the 2nd of June.

36950. Mr. Walker.—Officially?—Officially.

36951. Mr. Sullivan.—When you were making that report to the Board on Mr. Hickey's statement had you not the original before you of the note referred to in it?—were not documents one, two, three and four sent to you along with it?—I really do not know. Here are the instructions—"Send this letter to Mr. Knox, Head Inspector, and direct he will state if he thinks Mr. Hickey's explanation strictly accurate, and in all respects satisfactory." There is nothing about notes, and I don't remember anything about notes.

36952. But were the documents A, B, and C, that were attached to it not appended to it then?—I could not say.

36953. Is not that the usual practice?—It is the usual practice, but I should think that they were not, because they are not included in the order.

36954. When the Board order a document to be sent to anyone is it not the usual course to send with the document all the documents referred to in it, and which are really and substantially a part of it?—Very often the Commissioners determine what documents are to go, and send only a portion.

36955. Am I to understand that the practice of the office was not carried out in this instance—that this was an exception to the rule?—I cannot say.

36956. Then you never saw the document itself—the memorandum of Lord Ashdown?—I dare say I did, but I do not remember it.

36957. Then this statement in your report that "Dr. Meenan's application was not made, I believe, till after he had received Lord Ashdown's note from Mr. Hickey, and brought it before the Roman Catholic bishop and a number of his clergy assembled at Ballyroan" is not true?—I believed it to be true when I made that statement, and I see nothing has turned up since to contradict it.

36958. You now find, however, that it is not a correct statement?—No, I do not, I do not admit that. I have not got the document before me. I see that on the face of this document here the Ballyroan application was not notified to Mr. Hickey until—

36959. The Chairman.—Does it not appear from the passage you have just read from Mr. Hickey's letter that he communicated Lord Ashdown's note to Dr. Meenan at or after his first visit to Killyn?—Yes, that appears from Mr. Hickey's letter.

36960. That visit was on the 22nd of May?—The visit to one of the schools was on the 22nd of May.

36961. The visit to Killyn?—I think it is the 22nd of May.

36962. Does it not appear from your file of papers that Dr. Meenan's application for Ballyroan had been sent to the Commissioners on the 10th of May?—Yes, his letter requesting aid.

36963. That being so does it appear that your belief that Dr. Meenan's application was not made until after he had received Lord Ashdown's note was correct?—Oh, it is quite clear that if he had received Lord Ashdown's note after the 10th of May, and had made his application on the 10th of May; the application was of prior date to the letter—that is quite clear.

36964. Mr. Sullivan.—How do you explain this part of your letter:—"I, at least, never intimated that Dr. Meenan made any such attempt either by letter or in conversation, and from the very absence of interference on the part of Dr. Meenan one may fairly ask why did not Mr. Hickey report at once on the Killyn applicant school?" Does that refer to your first report upon the case?—I never exactly made a report upon the case. I wrote a letter.

36965. That was before the fine was inflicted?—Yes, that was on the 24th of June.

36966. Read that letter?—(Reads).—

"24 June, 1854."

"GENTLEMEN.—In accordance with your instructions of the twelfth instant, I accompanied Mr. Hickey, District Inspector, on the twentieth instant, to the Killyn and Ballyroan applicant schools. The applicant parties received due notice of our visit. We proceeded first to the Killyn school, as the application for aid to it was of prior date, and should, in my opinion, have been disposed of by Mr. Hickey before. We next visited the Ballyroan school, and afterwards waited on Lord Ashdown, at his lordship's request."

"After the most careful inquiry into the particulars of each school, I told Mr. Hickey the course I advised, leaving him to draw up the reports in his own language, and not in any way requiring him to conform to my views, unless he should think fit to do so."

"As I have not had an opportunity of seeing Mr. Hickey's report on these schools, and as it struck me that on some points we were not unanimous, I deem it advisable to set forth briefly some particulars which may assist the Commissioners of National Education in their consideration of these applications. To do this it will be necessary to enter into a short history of the schools."

"Lord Ashdown is the proprietor of the townland in which these schools are situated, and of the country for miles round. His Lordship, towards the end of last year, proposed to the

Feb. 23, 1855.

—  
William  
Robert  
Newell, Esq.,  
Ct.-cl.

Feb. 20, 1855.  
 —  
 William  
 Howitt  
 Secy. genl.  
 L.A.S.

Rector, the Rev. E. D. H. Knox, that he should place his school, which had been previously in connection with the Church Education Society, under the Board of National Education, as he (Lord A.) was anxious that his Roman Catholic tenants should be able to educate their children without being required to accede to objectionable conditions. Mr. Knox alleges that, contrary to his expectations, he agreed to Lord Ashburn's proposal, and made application for aid to the Commissioners of National Education. As soon as it became known to the Rev. Dr. Meahan, &c., that application had been made for aid to establish a National school in the village of Ballyorgan, he urged upon Lord Ashburn to appoint a Roman Catholic teacher, as the majority of the children in the locality were Roman Catholics, in the proportion of at least five to one. To this request Lord Ashburn would not assent. Mr. Meahan then determined to establish a National school under his own management, made the usual application, and wrote to the District Inspector, Mr. Hickey, begging of him to defer forwarding his report upon the Ballyorgan applicant school until the Ballyorgan applicant school would be ready for his inspection. Mr. Hickey complied with Dr. Meahan's request and held over his report on the Ballyorgan school. On Mr. Hickey's first visit to Ballyorgan he suggested to Lord Ashburn that if a Roman Catholic paid assistant were appointed all parties might be induced to co-operate in supporting one common school for the education of the children of every religious denomination. His lordship assented to the suggestion by writing a formal note on the subject, but in this note Lord A. reserved to himself and his heirs the right to do away "with such appointment" at pleasure. Dr. Meahan, by advice of the Roman Catholic clergy, rejected a compromise upon such terms. On my reading this note it appeared to me ambiguous, so I asked his lordship if he meant that he reserved the right to do away with the appointment, or the right of dismissing the individual holding the appointment, and, in case of such dismissal, nominating another person of the Roman Catholic religion to the office. His lordship stated in reply that he merely meant to reserve, in pursuance of the right of appointing and dismissing the individual, and further, observed that, if the attendance would warrant it, he would apply for an assistant Roman Catholic teacher. Had this fact been known at an earlier date much unnecessary feeling might have been avoided, and I think that there is still a reasonable prospect that after a little time the Rev. E. D. H. Knox and the Rev. Dr. Meahan will consent to the children of their respective congregations attending one National school under the patronage of Lord Ashburn and conducted by two teachers, one Protestant and one Roman Catholic.

#### BALLYORGAN AFFILIATE SCHOOL.

"This school is held in the village of Ballyorgan, opposite to the Roman Catholic chapel, in a thatched house, containing two rooms, with a door between. Both rooms are occupied by the pupils. The furniture is sufficient, and the house unsupervisable, but the manager has a much more eligible house, to which he proposes transferring the pupils. The school opened on the 1st February, 1855, under conduct of William Campbell, a Protestant, aged twenty-four years, trained in 1840 (young class), and placed in the first division of second class. The attendance from the 1st of February to the 31st of May was as follows:—

#### AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE.

Month.	Males	Females
February.	97	13 10
March.	84	12 13
April.	62	10 7
May.	53	9 5
	399	43 43

"Total, 762, or average for four months, 1905, being somewhat less than 50 of a daily average. Mr. Hickey, having taken the attendance for a different period, makes the average, I believe, a little over 20. The highest number on the books is 94. Present on the 25th instant, 31. The school is now left open to children of all religious denominations, and the parents of children of the Roman Catholic faith would have access to the school-rooms to instruct the Roman Catholic children on Saturdays.

"The application appears to be in every respect deserving of support from the Board, unless the usual attendance should be considered a barrier to its success.

#### BALLYORGAN AFFILIATE SCHOOLS.

"This school is held in a portion of the chapel of Ballyorgan, which has been separated by a large canvas screen, nailed to the ground, and side walls. The inside of the chapel is visible from the school-rooms through the interstices of the canvas. The space devoted to school purposes is sufficiently commodious, and the apartment is well finished.

"The school opened, according to teacher's statement, in January last, but the only record of the pupils' attendance is a list of the names, which amount to 141. There were 55 boys and 51 girls present, of whom 32 boys and 12 girls lived in the neighbourhood of and attended National schools. There is, however, no doubt that there would be at all times a numerous attendance. The teacher's name is Timothy Donaghy, aged twenty years, and not trained. He was educated at Lancaster by the Christian Brothers. He is not, in my opinion, qualified as a probationary teacher. See Appendix A.

"On account of the teacher's want of literary qualifications, and the school being held in portion of the Ballyorgan Roman Catholic chapel, which gives it a denominational character, I cannot recommend this case to the favourable consideration of the Commissioners of National Education.

"I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

"Your very obedient servant,

"W. H. NEWALL, Head Inspector.

"The Secretaries."

20567. Dr. Meahan, from the report upon Mr. Hickey's statement, derived, did he not, that he had written as you have stated there?—Yes, he did. He stated that he had not communicated with Mr. Hickey.

"Dr. Meahan denies that he, by letter, intended Mr. Hickey to go out of his way in the discharge of his duty as an officer of the Board of National Education."

20568. Have you a copy of the letter of Mr. Hickey to Mr. Meahan?—No, I have not. I find I have copies of three letters of Mr. Meahan.

20569. You have not the original letter?—No, I have no original.

20570. Or a copy of them?—I have a copy of a letter here signed by Lord Ashburn, and I have copies of three letters which I have seen for the first time, because I was only ordered to bring over these things to-day, and to look the matter up in a very great hurry. I have copies of three letters signed "P. Meahan."

20571. What is the date of the first of the three?—May 25th, 1854.

20572. Read that?—(Reads):—

"Ballsborough, May 25th, 1854.

"Sir,—As the Bishop has been in Dublin during the past week, I have no opportunity of communicating to him the letter you have left in my possession. I will see him at Conference in Bruff on this day week, the 1st of June, and will submit to him the letter and the assembled clergy the proposition of Lord Ashburn. Were I to send him the letter I might not receive an answer before the day of Conference. As you are so kind and anxious to have the matter settled, I hope it will not put you to any inconvenience by my retaining an answer until after an interview with the Bishop.

"I remain your obedient servant,

"(Signed) P. Meahan."

20573. Then it appears from that letter, acknowledged on the 25th of May, that it must have been just immediately before that 25th of May, that the letter of Lord Ashburn was given to Mr. Meahan?—I do not know what the date was. He says, "Communicating the letter which you have left in my possession."

20574. When did Dr. Meahan answer finally?—His next letter is the 3rd of June. He says:—

"Ballsborough, June 3rd, 1854.

"Dear Sir,—I return you the enclosed letter, and beg to say that I would not have received it were it not for your very great kindness. I have to inform you that I consulted the Right Rev. Dr. Ryan about the school at Ballyorgan, and he would not allow me to dissolve my school on the terms contained in the enclosed letter. As the Catholic children are so numerous, it is in his opinion that a Catholic should be appointed to instruct them, and as no other condition is so disposed to compromise the matter.

"I remain your obedient servant,

"(Signed) P. Meahan."

20575. Read the postscript?—There is no postscript to this.

20576. Is that a true copy?—I do not know. There is a postscript to the next.

20577. In the copy that I have before me there is a postscript?—There is no postscript in the copy that I have.

20278 The *Chairman*.—Will you ascertain whether the original is now in possession of the Board, and if so whether there is any postscript attached to it?—I shall try to do so.

20279 Mr. Sullivan.—What is the third letter of Dr. Madden's?—The 15th of December, 1834. (Reads).—

Belfast, 15th September, 1834  
 "Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 17th instant, I take leave to state that the idea, that I wrote a letter to you begging you to go out of your way in the discharge of your duty as an officer of the Commissioners of National Education, is a pure fiction. Where it could originate, except in the very fertile imagination of my rev. friend and neighbor, Mr. Knox, I am at a loss to know. I trust I have sufficient respect for myself as well as for the Board of Education, not to stoop to the impropriety of tampering with their office in the discharge of its serious and important duties, you have with great and far education undereared to accommodate the very wide difference existing here, and you placed in my hands a letter containing a presentation of compromise from Lord and Lady Ashurst. I then asked you if you were at liberty to defer your report on the *Killybegs* application, until I should have an opportunity of consulting with my bishop, Right Rev. Dr. Ryan, on the very grave question at issue, your reply was that you felt not only at liberty, but that you considered it your duty to do so.

"I remain, dear sir, your obedient servant,

"(Signed) P. MCGLOTHLIN, D.D."

"P.S.—I beg also to state that Mr. Knox consented that you should postpone sending your report on the *Killybegs* school, until I should have consulted my bishop on the matter. I have a clear and distinct recollection of this."

"(Signed) P.M."

20280 Have you the letter dated the 14th of December, 1834, communicating to Mr. Hickey the result of the Board's decision upon your report?—I have no such letter.

20281 I presume you will be able to say whether a letter is in the handwriting of Mr. Cross?—Yes, I should know Mr. Cross's handwriting, but I have not got a copy of the letter here.

20282 The Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is such a case as this

an unusual one in the history of the Board—when one party has taken action to have a school another makes undue haste in order to be beforehand with him?—Well, I think it is rather uncommon.

20283 Has it occurred?—I could not quote an instance, but I am satisfied that there have been instances.

20284 Have you ever been accused of partiality to clerics on account of their religion?—Never, I am afraid that there was a line of examination passed here that would have a tendency to convey that; and I am very glad I have an opportunity of stating that in my whole career I have most studiously guarded myself against entertaining prejudice against any man on account of his religion. I have treated every man under me according to his merits and his deserts, quite irrespective of religion; and in connection with those who have been punished since I became secretary, I may make this remark, that of the eight clerics who were severely punished by the Board at my suggestion, and I will say very deservedly punished, five were Protestants and three were Roman Catholics, though the majority of the staff are Roman Catholics. I have nothing more to add on the subject.

20285 Mr. Sullivan.—When you say that you have not been accused of it, that is to your own knowledge?—Of course, you give me credit for greater facilities than I possess, or perhaps anyone else possesses.

20286 Rev. Dr. Wilson.—I wish to know with regard to the Newry-Barnagade school near Banis—was it a vested school?—It was a vested school.

20287 Vested in local trustees?—I think so.

20288 To which the Commissioners of National Education had contributed a considerable sum of money?—Yes.

20289 It passed into the hands of the Christian Brothers?—It did.

20290 Will you furnish this Commission with the correspondence on the subject?—We have furnished the Commission with the entire correspondence in detail, and a very lengthy correspondence it is.

THOMAS H. CRAIG, Esq., sworn and examined,

Thomas  
Craig, Esq.

20291 Mr. Sullivan.—How long have you been connected with the central establishment in Mulborough-street?—Upwards of eighteen years.

20292 What office do you hold at present?—I am a second-class clerk in the Registry and Salary office.

20293 Were you acquainted with Mr. McCreedy's scheme for the amalgamation of the offices?—I was. It was through me the specimen books that were brought out were headed and drafted. There is a copy of one of them before you.

20294 Will you explain to the Commissioners the principle on which Mr. McCreedy intended the amalgamation should be carried out?—He wished to have thirty men—each man having charge of two districts. There would make up the sixty districts into which the entire country is divided. And this book was got up for the purpose of superseding the registry book, the salary book, and the long book. Not only that, but the Salary Books are ordered from year to year, or every two years—this book would last at least for ten years—so there would be not only a saving in not having duplicate entries in different books, but also in not requiring books from year to year.

20295 Then you would have superseded the Inspection office, the Registry and Salary office, and the Correspondence office?—Yes.

20296 At present the arrangement is by counties?—Yes.

20297 What arrangement did Mr. McCreedy propose to make?—To have it by districts.

20298 Then all the letters that go now into the Correspondence office to one set of clerks, would they come to the same men who carried out the work?—Yes.

20299 So that each man would be acquainted with all the particulars of the school, from the reception of the first letter until it was finally dealt with?—Yes. At present the letter has to go from one department to another.

20300 What amount of time in ordinary cases would that save?—I consider myself it would save nearly half the time.

20301 The Registry and Salary office is very various in its duties at present?—It is.

20302 Would the amalgamated functions of the clerks be more various in reality than those which the clerks in the Registry and Salary office are obliged to discharge at present?—Not much.

20303 What would be the increase of work that would be put upon the clerks in the office, if the amalgamation were to take place?—The correspondence only.

20304 What would they be relieved from?—There should be sixteen men in the department. There are not so many now. The thirty men would be an additional fourteen. They would be relieved of 14-20th of their present business.

20305 Would the amount of work to be done by each individual clerk be great?—It would not be altered so far as the increase by this plan.

20306 If this plan were adopted, would there be the same necessity of looking after documents travelling from one office to another?—No, each man would have the document either in his own possession or in the possession of the clerk next to him—whenever checks the work.

20307 Would the clerk be then much better acquainted than at present, with each school he had to

Feb. 25, 1867.

—  
Thomas H.  
Craig, esq.

deal with it.—Most undoubtedly, because he would have a smaller number of schools, and would know all the correspondence connected with them.

27008. Does it often occur that a clerk notes upon a document the action that is to be taken upon it?—Yes.

27009. What does the Chief of Inspection, or the Secretary do then with the document?—He puts his initials, as an authority to write a letter, or perhaps he may in some cases make some modification.

27010. Generally, however, the action is as it were, indicated beforehand?—Yes.

27011. Might that matter be left to the discretion of the clerks in certain cases?—I do not see anything to prevent it.

27012. What class of cases would you entrust to the discretion of the clerk?—Ordinary correspondence, such as writing about repairs—and that each school should be open for a given time during the year—things of this kind, the course as to which is well established, as well known to the clerks as to the Secretaries.

27013. That you have settled forms for?—Yes; established principles for dealing with them.

27014. Such, I suppose, as the clerks in point of fact do at present, only that the matter has to go through a formal course of proceeding?—Just so, to go through a matter of form. They have authority in some instances.

27015. In the case of payment of salaries, is not the custom of the office quite uniform?—Yes.

27016. In cases of fines—are they not dealt with in the same manner?—As a general rule the fine is deducted the next quarter after being inflicted. So we have the entry of the fine in the books before we send out the salary less the fine.

27017. If these matters were left to the clerks to carry out the entire business respecting them without referring every case to two or three departments, would there be much saving of time?—I believe there would. In the case, for example, of the appointment of a manager to a National school, if the school is non-vested, and if there is no committee of the school, the parish priest, as a matter of course, becomes the manager. So that, according to my notion, when a clergyman writes saying he has succeeded another as parish priest, and that we know he is the parish priest, all we would require to do would be to enter his name as manager at once.

27018. Were the heads and superintendents of departments generally favourable to the scheme?—Mr. Macnamara, when he was speaking to him about it, and that Dr. Newell was opposed to it.—Mr. Madden said he thought the scheme ought to get a fair trial. That was the last I heard of it. Mr. Keenan seemed to be in favour of it, and when the hearings were drawn up Mr. Kelly agreed with Mr. McCreedy.

27019. What objections have been raised against this proposed amalgamation of offices?—Well, really I never heard any valid objection.

27020. The "Long Book" would be done away with?—Yes, the Long Book would be done away with, the Salary Book and the reading of reports three or four times over would be done away with, because the report is first read over in the Inspection office, it is noted by the clerk in charge and then in the abstraction we have to read it over again. So that it is read twice when once would be sufficient.

27021. What condition is the office in physically?—Well, there are some such—there are some vacancies occasioned by death—and the office is overcrowded.

27022. Have you ever heard that the principal rooms in which the clerks work is ill-heated and ill-ventilated?—Yes, it is burning hot in summer, and extremely cold in winter, the ceiling is low.

27023. Within the last six or eight years, how many clerks have died out of the long room?—About eight or nine from the one room.

27024. The Commission.—Were any of those aged persons?—Yes, some of them were, but the greater number of them were young.

27025. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Were they delicate in

health before coming into the office?—Excepting one, I do not know of any having been delicate.

27026. Mr. Sullivan.—Were there many complaints made on this subject?—Yes, there have been complaints, and Mr. Owen of the Board of Works has been in the office several times, but the room remains as before.

27027. Has it come to your knowledge in any way, that a vote was taken last year for remedying the defects in the room?—Yes, I believe there was.

27028. Do you know whether it is intended to carry out the purpose of that vote?—I do not.

27029. Is going to the fire in very cold weather a very common cause of complaint against the clerks?—Yes.

27030. Are these complaints registered against them?—Not registered, but the head of the department has been told to tell the clerks they are not to go to the fire.

27031. Does the extreme cold of the office in severe winters mar a good deal the efficient working of the clerks?—It does.

27032. Mr. O'Shea.—Is the office you speak of in Talbot-street?—It is the office parallel with the passage down to the female school.

27033. It is on the second story?—It is.

27034. There is no story above that?—No.

27035. That was built by the Board of Works?—Part of it was built, as well as I remember, under Mr. Darley, who was the Board's architect.

27036. With respect to that book of Mr. McCreedy's for the office business—were you ever called before the Board to express an opinion about it?—I was not. I knew that immediately before this book was ordered there were meetings held week after week, of a number of the Commissioners. I think you were one of the Commissioners, and after a while the meetings ceased. They adopted his plan.

27037. Did Mr. Keenan approve of it?—He approved of it, and used to me some time ago that he thought these books were in use.

27038. Who objected to it?—Dr. Newell.

27039. Your recollection is that Mr. Kelly approved of it?—Mr. Kelly approved of it. Mr. McCreedy took over a piece of paper to him, and he made some slight change of heading, which change was carried out.

[The witness having shown Mr. O'Shea, the original letter written by him as to the advantages of the District Books, was now asked—Why did you write that letter to the Chief of Inspection, Mr. Keenan and Dr. Newell?—As they were the immediate heads of my department.]

27040. What is the long book?—A book in which is entered the date of a report, the nature of the report whether primary, secondary, or incidental, and also a mark to show it has been finally dealt with.

27041. Do you not think there ought to be a regular record of everything done in the office, the particular action on any document either sent in or out?—Yes.

27042. Mr. Sullivan.—That book before you contains columns for noting the date of receipt of a document, of letters sent out, of the action taken, and final result?—Yes; columns Nos. 1 and 2 are intended for all correspondence and Board's Orders, &c., in reference to the school, Columns 3 to 9 are to contain a short abstract of every primary and secondary report from the Inspectors, the date of the Inspector's report, the attendance present, and the general character of the school as to the supply of books, &c., as to the numbers and necessary of the school accounts, and whether the school since the last inspection has progressed, retrograded, or remained stationary. All defects, reported, and written on, will appear under the heading "correspondence." Columns 10 to 15 are to comprise the names of all the teachers, assistant-teachers, workmistresses, and monitor, to show whether they are trained or untrained, together with their classification and the rates at which they are paid. The next heading, viz, Salary Payments (columns 16 to 20), is intended for the quarterly payments of all grades of the teaching staff. No. 16 for the amount

des. No. 17 for the marking off of the receipt for payment, after its return to the Education Office, 18 for the number of the requisition sheet on which the Post Office are called upon to issue the Post Office order—39 for the quarter. The next column is for the entry of such observations, &c., in relation to broken payments, as may be found necessary for future reference. Under the heading "Promises and Gratifications" are to be given the date of the Board's Order making the grant, the number of the documents on which the grant is made, the nature of the grant, the period for which the grant is made, the date of sending out the receipt, the amount granted the time the receipt is marked off, and the number of the requisition sheet on which the Post order is called upon to issue

the P. O. order. Under the head "Requisites," are to be given the date and the amount of all requisites and school apparatus purchased for the school, or granted to it as free stock.

27043. Mr. Gibson.—Was Mr. Cluridge consulted about that?—No, it does not come under his department. There are only entries of requisites in order to complete the Appendix to the Commissioners' Report, we add up the value of requisites received within a year. That is for the Commissioners' Report. In Mr. Cluridge's department they have sufficient information as regards the requisites in their own particular books. I don't know whether Mr. McCready showed this book to Mr. Cluridge or not.

[Adjourned.]

Feb. 23, 1869

Thomas H. Craig, esq.

# SEVENTY-FIRST DAY—DUBLIN, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1869.

## PRESENT:

The Right Hon. The Earl of Powers, Chairman.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. The Lord Bishop of MEATH.

The Right Hon. Lord CLONMACK.

The Right Hon. Mr. JAMES MURPHY.

Sir ROBERT KANE, B.A.

WILLIAM BROOKER, Esq., M.C.

Rev. DAVID WILSON, D.D.

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COFFEY, B.D.

JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, Esq.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Q.C.

SCOTT NANCYTH STOKES, Esq.

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., F.R.S.

LAURENCE WALSHAM, Esq.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., Q.C.

D. B. DUNNE, Esq.,

} Secretaries.

His Eminence Cardinal Cullen, further examined.

Feb. 26, 1869

His Eminence Cardinal Cullen.

27044. The Chairman.—Does your Eminence wish to make to the Commissioners any statement regarding the ordinary National schools?—If you allow me, my lord, I will make a short statement. I spoke on the last day about the general principle that religion ought to be the basis of all education, and then I endeavored to show that mixed education is opposed to that first principle. I next endeavored to show by reference to other countries, that the general feeling, amongst Catholics especially, is adverse to mixed education, or to the mixed system. Having endeavored to prove these points, I shall now speak of the system as it prevails in this country. The mixed system was introduced I believe in the end of 1831, or the beginning of 1832, and it was based upon a letter written to the Duke of Leinster by Lord Stanley, then Secretary of State for Ireland. He had down a certain plan which was adopted as an experiment by the Catholics. The Catholic Archbishop of Dublin at the time, Dr. Murray, took an active part in establishing it, and several of the other Catholic bishops wished to give it a trial. Little by little, finding that it did not work well, they became dissatisfied, and at length all the Catholic prelates, and the great mass of the Catholic people began to condemn a system which was gradually developed in a way injurious to their religion. I think this change of feeling towards the National system has been brought about to a great extent by the modifications which were made in the original system as proposed by Lord Stanley. Lord Stanley as appears from his letter, which is published in the first volume of the reports of the Board, from 1834 to 1845, says that the system was to be one of "a combined literary and a separate religious education." The literary instruction was to be common to persons of different religions, but the religious education was to be separate, Catholic for Catholics exclusively, and Protestant for Protestants exclusively. In the same letter he says that one of the duties of the Board was to edit and print such books of moral and literary education as might be approved of for the use of the schools. There was to be nothing about religion according to that prospectus, either in the

teaching, or in the books of the school. All that was changed very soon. Books were introduced containing a great deal of religious matter, and long extracts from the Old and New Testament. These Scriptural books were prepared principally by the Rev. Mr. Curdle, who was one of the Commissioners, at that time, and by the late Archbishop, Dr. Whately, and some members of his family. The introduction into the schools of books compiled by Protestants, to be used in giving religious instruction to Catholics, and frequently to be explained to them by Protestant teachers, was a measure which naturally could not be approved of by the Catholic prelates and Catholic people of Ireland.

In the original plan as sketched out by Lord Stanley, the clergy were permitted and encouraged to give religious instruction to the children of their respective parishes, either before or after the ordinary school hours, on four days of the week, and to devote one or two days altogether to such instruction. Now the rules in operation at present, give full permission to the managers of the schools to exclude all religious teaching from them, to make them perfectly godless, or to have only one particular religious sort of teaching given in the school.

27045. You mean the non-vested schools?—In the non-vested schools. The rule which gives power to the patrons to exclude all religious instruction is found in Part 4, No. 2 of the rules. The words are—"In schools not vested, and which receive no other aid than salary and books, it is for the patrons or managers to determine whether any, and if any, what religious instruction shall be given in the school room." So the manager can exclude all religion—he can exclude the clergy of every denomination, and have no religion at all. Or, if the school be under a Catholic, the Catholic can exclude the Protestant pastor—or, if the school be under a Protestant he can on the other hand exclude the Catholic priest or Catholic bishop from having any connection whatever with the school in a religious point of view. That is an important change which has had great influence. I think in exciting a bad feel-

Feb. 24, 1889.  
The Birming-  
ham  
Gleaner.

ing against the National system. There was another change made very early by the Board. In page 4 of the letter of Lord Stanley, it is required "that a register shall be kept in the schools, in which shall be entered the attendance or non-attendance of each child on Divine Worship on Sundays." That has been altogether abandoned, or never carried out.

Again, in the beginning, Christian Brothers—whose schools are religious—were allowed to get grants from the Board, and there was no interference with their domestic arrangements. That permission has been withdrawn, and the rule since 1855 is that no one who makes religious vows, and no one in Holy Orders shall be allowed to teach in a National school. That, I think, was a very mischievous change. It excluded our best teachers from being connected with the National Board. In the beginning several schools of Christian Brothers were connected with the Board, and if they had been allowed to continue their own system they would have maintained their connection with it. They are the very best teachers in the country, and their schools cost very little. So it is an evil, both in a financial and a religious and literary point of view to have their services excluded.

In the beginning schools kept by nuns were put on the same footing as other schools, and the nuns were paid in the same manner as the other teachers. In 1839 a change was made, by which nuns were to continue to be paid by capitation, though a more favorable system was adopted in regard to others—and in this way the nuns receive less for the education of children than teachers inferior to them. The payment allowed to nuns is £30 for every hundred children, that is 4s. a head, whereas in some of the National schools the payment is more than £1 per head. There was another change—Lord Stanley in a letter to a deputation from the Synod of Ulster, stated that the National schools were to be considered the property of the managers, or of the local directors—not the property of the State. The same is repeated in the report of 1841. The words are—"The National schools are not so much the schools of the Government, as of the local patrons and managers." That was changed about 1845. When the Commissioners were incorporated they contrived to get the estate in all the schools handed over to themselves, so that the schools might become the property of the National Board. The attempt to seize on the property of others also tended very much to excite the jealousy of the country against the National system.

I must add, that as the owners of the schools have a right to nominate the masters, so the attempt to get the school property into the hands of the Board shows the anxiety of the Commissioners to get the nomination of teachers under their own control. This anxiety manifests itself in another matter: the Commissioners have given to their Inspectors the right of appointing paid monitors or assistant teachers, and the Inspectors have actually nominated more than two thousand persons of that class without thinking it necessary to do so with the concurrence of the owners of the schools. All this is in opposition to the original plan of Lord Stanley, it opens the way for the undue exercise of Government influence, and it interferes with the rights of patrons and managers.

In the original rules it was laid down by Lord Stanley that—"The rights of the parents of the people should be fully recognized. The managers, says he, 'will permit and encourage the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective parishes, either before or after the ordinary school hours on the other days of the week.'" Mr. Girdwell, in a letter which he addressed to myself, for the other bishops, says—"The Government cheerfully recognizes the right which belongs, and the duty which attaches to the heads of the respective churches in regard to religious instruction, and desires to afford to the clergy every possible facility and encouragement for the discharge of their important duties." That also has been done away with, by the

last rules published, in which there is nothing about the rights of the parish priest, or the minister of the locality. There is nothing whatsoever about episcopal authority in regard to the schools. The only restriction which that in vested schools, on certain occasions, the clergy of the locality will be admitted to give religious instruction to the children of their own denomination. In the old rules at page 7 of this report, in the instructions laid down for the managers of schools, it is said that they are to encourage the pastors of the different religious denominations to give instruction to the children of their respective flocks out of school hours, affording to such pastors facilities of access to the people at the times specified, and not employing or remunerating them. Thus the managers and patrons were to encourage instruction by the pastors. The choice of the place for religious instruction was left also to the pastors, according to the same instruction on the same page. In the present rules the whole system is changed. In Part IV., No. 2, it is—"Religious instruction must be so arranged that each school shall be open to children of all communions, that due regard be had to parental rights and authority; that, accordingly, no child shall receive, or be present at, any religious instruction of which his parents or guardians disapprove, and that the time for giving it be so fixed that no child shall be thereby in effect excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the school affords." That is in contradiction with the system laid down originally by Lord Stanley, which left to the clergy to determine what religious instruction should be given, and at what times it should be given. This change in the rules, though it appears a very simple thing, is very important. Here we have a question of the education of the poorer classes. The poor are unfortunately ignorant, and not sufficiently independent to resist the wishes of those who are in a higher station than themselves. Hence the abolishing of the protection of the children to their parental power is not sufficient to preserve them from proselytism. Of course parental authority is to be maintained, but I wish to observe that in the case of poor children, it is sometimes not sufficient for their protection.

As there are persons who in order to obtain more control over the children of the poor, assume in some cases to interfere with the rights of parents, I will here add some words on those rights. As Catholics, we assert the parental right to its fullest extent; it is a portion of the Canon law that even the children of Jews cannot be interfered with, contrary to the instructions or the wishes of their parents. I have here a passage from Benedict XIV., a very distinguished pope of the last century, in which he treats of Jewish children presented to the Church for baptism. The passage is from his Apostolical letters to Monsignor Gagliardi, dated 19th December, 1751 (*Bullarium*, tom. 366, page 187, seq.) paragraph 10.

"Many writers as well theologians as canonists, have discussed the question now under consideration, viz., to whom belongs the right of presenting for baptism children who are infants, or have not as yet attained the age of puberty. These writers say, in the first place, that the right of offering their children rests with the parents, whether these be Christians, or Pagans, or Jews. Conformable to the doctrine St. Thomas teaches that, as a rule, the children of unbelievers cannot be admitted to baptism without the consent of their parents; this teaching has been generally adopted by other writers, and it is founded on and followed by the ecclesiastical tribunals."

That passage shows what the practice of the Catholic Church is. I have also a passage from St. Thomas Aquinas, in which he discusses the same question, and shows it has been always the practice of the Church to allow full control over children to their parents, and from the practice of the Church he concludes that children are not to be baptized, or their religion interfered with, without the consent of the parents. The passage from St. Thomas is in Latin; in substance it is nearly the same as that which I have read from Benedict XIV.

"S. Thomas Aquinas, 2, 2<sup>a</sup>, Quæst. 4, Art. 21.

"Non sunt inhibentes pater invidi parvulus baptizari quia id continetur Deo committitur coramam sequenda non pater prohibet, quod et iustissime naturam respicit, et non licet in potestate vestri posset."

"Respondens, dicens quod maximum habet auctoritatem Ecclesie committenda; quæ semper est in causis secularibus: quia et ipse dominus ecclesiasticas Doctrinas ad Ecclesiam committenda habet: unde magis statuta est auctoritas Ecclesie, quam auctoritas vel Angelus, vel Imperator, vel cuiuscunque doctoris. Hæc ergo Ecclesie non auctoritas habet, quod Judæorum filii invidi parvulus baptizantur; quoniam facit retrocedere longioribus ad antiquos principes pontificum, et Constantium, Theodosium, quibus familiaris fuerant sanctissimi concilio et beatorum Constantino, et Ambrosio. Theodosius quoque talis non protulit auctoritatem, si hoc esset consuetudinem. Et idcirco pontificum videtur habere auctoritatem de novo inhibere, et præter commissa divina. Ecclesie hæc sunt observantia, Judæorum filios baptizant, filia baptizant. Et hoc non potest dupliciter. Uno quoniam propter penam fidei. Si enim quis non daretur non auctoritate habens, baptizans transgesserit potestatem cum ad perfectum actum venerit, de fidei posset a parentibus scire, et illisque non quod ignorare accepit: quod regit et in fide determinatur. Alio vero talis est, qui respondet auctoritate naturalis. Pater enim auctoritatem ad illud patris. Et primo quidem a parentibus non distinguuntur eorum corpus, quando in matris utero concipiunt; postmodum vero postquam ab utero egrediatur uterque cum liberi utriusque habent, cessante sub potestate cum dicit ab eodem quatuor habet, quando enim mater indicat non licet pater, non debet ab auctoritate detrahere."

These Catholics admit the parental right over children, but not to the exclusion of the authority of the Church: when once Catholics have declared themselves subjects of the Church, as a matter of course they are bound as long as they remain Catholics, to be guided by the decisions and by the authority of the Church. If they obstinately disobey the Church, they become schismatics. If they deny the teaching of the Church, they lose their faith, and cease to be members of the Church. Persons not subject to the Church, do just as they wish—the Church does not interfere with them. Those who have declared themselves subjects of the Church, who have submitted themselves to the authority of the Church, and submit its authority to be Divine, are, as a matter of course, obliged to be guided by the authority of the Church.

I have got a couple of passages connected with the National Board, which show that neither its paternal authority is not a good protection for the children. The first passage is from Archbishop Stopford, who explains how ecclesiastical or pastoral authority was set aside by the Board, to make room for parental authority, and afterwards shows how easily that paternal authority was ignored by the same Board:—

"It appears to have been felt that this part of their charter (responsibility of parental authority) was ill-adapted to effect useful education. The Board have been preferred to found their value on such a principle. They have, in fact, skillfully set it aside, and substituted a different principle in its place. About the year 1842 they applied for and obtained official recognition of Lord Stanley's letter. One object of these explanations was to substitute parental for priestly authority, as the principle to which attention was to be made."

How easily parental authority when it clashes with Protestant views, can be set aside, the Archbishop explains in the same report:—

"A parent may prohibit his child learning these commandments of God which, as his baptism, he possesses to keep. Such a prohibition, even from a parent, would be of no moral obligation whatsoever."

Again, in a pamphlet of 1847, he says:—

"Were that child persuaded in his own mind, and capable of understanding that he was bound to hear the Word of God, although prohibited by his earthly parents, and were he to proceed himself to his Scriptures alone, I would advise him. That would not be an interference with the child's religious possession, nor would it involve any violation of his obligations to the parent as defined in my application to the Board."

Accordingly, parental authority would not protect a Catholic child from proselytism in the Archbishop's

National school. The Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately, who was, I may say, the life and founder of the Board, gives a similar explanation in his evidence in 1854, question 1418:—

"Supposing that a parent is anxious to prevent his children from receiving religious education in a particular school, and that, for the purpose of protecting them from that, he gives distinct warning to the patron, or to the schoolmaster, that his children are not to receive it, can the children be returned if they are disposed to stay and receive instruction, notwithstanding that prohibition on the part of the parent?"

"The rule of the Board in such a case, as I have already said, is that we never require the patron to consult the parents, or to listen to the parents at all, except by the actual attendance or non-attendance of the children. If the patron of a school were directly influenced by the parents that they wished their children not to read the Bible, the patron of the school might say that (and I fear such cases, though very few, have come before us). 'Then tell him to retire at such an hour, when the time for reading the Bible or learning the Church Catechism is approaching' and if the next day the child attends nevertheless, the patron is at full liberty, as far as the Board is concerned, to suppose that the parent has changed his mind in the interim, and is willing that the child should attend."

"Supposing that the parent has not changed his mind, and goes to the school, and tells the patron, or the schoolmaster, that he has not changed his mind, and that his child has remained during the reading of the Bible in obedience to his command, what ought to be the conduct of the master of the National school, or of the patron of the National school, in such a case?"

"I can only speak of what the procedure of the Board is: we never interfere in such a case."

"In such a case, if complaint were made by the parent to the Board that, contrary to the express recommendation of his wisdom to the patron and to the master, the child had remained for religious instruction, does your Grace say that the Board would say, 'That is no concern of ours'?"

"The case has never actually occurred, but I have no doubt they would. They would say, 'You should make your child obey you better; it is your own look out.' We should certainly not interfere at least as far as my judgment goes. But the case having never occurred, I am speaking only hypothetically."

Thus, according to Dr. Whately, parental authority being set aside, the religion of any child may be exposed to great danger; if the manager of the school be a Catholic, he could make a Protestant child read the Catholic Catechism, if the child returned without the parent's consent; and a Protestant could act in the same way in regard to a Catholic child. Thus, by substituting parental for paternal authority, a great opening has been made for proselytism in the National schools.

There is another change in regard to the books. As I said a while ago, Lord Stanley stated that it would be in the charge of the Board to publish books of a moral and literary character. The Commissioners did not act in accordance with this prescription, but introduced a great quantity of religious matters into their school books. There is an analysis of these books published by the National Board, and circulated with them, in which the following account is given of the substance of the religious matters contained in them:—

"One of the main objects, in compiling and publishing this series, was to supply not merely the National schools, but the public generally, with works moral and religious in their character, without being sectarian. Lessons on the subject of Religion, drawn chiefly from the narratives of the Holy Scriptures, are interspersed through all the Reading Books, and constitute an interesting course of Sacred History. The lessons in the First Book are of a mixed kind, with one decidedly religious, several in the Second Book commemorate important religious truths, and are well fitted to create devout feelings. The religious sentiments inculcated in the Second and the Second Book, are of the purest and most devoted kind; the next work following affords a striking example of the successful manner in which some of the most important truths of Christianity are blended with secular instruction in the Irish National school books. The admirable abridgement of the parts of the Old Testament, in the Third book, is not intended as a substitute for the Bible, but to prepare the pupils for a more extended course of religious instruction, and a more historical study of the inspired volume. Apart from the Scriptural lessons contained in the Fourth Book it contains several practical pieces of a didactical

Feb. 25, 1859

The Right Rev.  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb. 24, 1862.  
His Response  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

character. The Supplement to the Fourth Book contains a summary of the Old Testament, including a detailed account of the Prophets, and the substance of their prophecies, besides several essays on religious subjects by Archbishop Whately and other eminent divines. The catechetical lessons in the Girls' Reading Book form a complete manual of moral and domestic duties, whether in single or married life, and the "Selections from the British Poets" are pervaded by a spirit of genuine piety, and are well adapted for family reading.

I believe this is a very fair account of the character of the books—they are religious, but not religious in a Catholic sense. None of the matters connected with religion were taken from Catholic works—many of the subjects were taken from Protestant writers and Protestant dignitaries, and are tinged with Protestant opinions, and expressed in languageavouring of Protestantism. Now regarding these books, the very fact of their containing so many religious matters gives the masters an opportunity of instructing, or of teaching directly their own religious opinions. Almost every question connected with Religion turns up occasionally in these books, and as there is a very serious difference on many of these points between Catholics and those who differ from them—in schools not under Catholic teachers, errors which Catholics look on as most fatal, may be inculcated. Every child has a right to ask the master for an explanation of the words and doctrines contained in the respective books. This appears from the Rev. Mr. Cullen's examination before a Parliamentary Committee in 1847. In answer to a question he says—

"Every subject brought forward in the reading lesson must be explained, and the master is expected to be able to answer the questions the children may put to him, and he cannot do that without considerable information."

So if the master be asked what is faith, or what is the Church—the master is mentioned very seldom in the book, I believe, but it occurs, or it may occur at all events. If the teacher were a Presbyterian or a member of the Established Church, he would give quite a different answer from what Catholics teach. In this way Catholics would be exposed to be taught doctrines contrary to faith, and to be inculcated with Protestantism. This statement is confirmed by several Protestant managers of schools, from whom I shall quote some passages. The first I take is from a pamphlet of the Rev. Mr. French, Rector of Newtownsmole. Speaking of this common religious instruction he says—

"We have in essence the same three creeds, and a large proportion of the prayers in our liturgies are the same, and it strikes me very forcibly, that when we teach the points of doctrine, we are agreed upon, we teach true religion. We teach what is generally understood by Protestants, when we teach the doctrines upon which Protestants and Romanists are agreed. I admit that, strictly speaking, Protestantism is protesting against error. But in another sense, we do teach Protestantism in the Protestant religion—the religion of the Reformation—is the simple truth of the Gospel, stripped of the errors superadded by the Church of Rome. For instance, in the National school books, probably many hundred times Christ is spoken of as 'Our Saviour.' The belief of that truth is as naked simplicity, constitutes a Protestant. The Roman Catholic does not believe in Christ as his Saviour, at the same full and simple way in which a Protestant believes him to teach. To constitute a young Romanist, the child must be taught that something else besides Christ is our Saviour. So to say that is the object, to have those points taught, in schools, upon which Protestants and Romanists agree, the Protestant has the advantage, and the patron can teach Protestantism, i.e., the doctrine of grace to every child in the school. I am of opinion that the patron might even pledge himself, under bond and seal, that he will let Romanists alone during certain hours of the day, so far as refraining from controversial teaching can be considered as necessarily letting Romanists alone. But in my judgment, if a Christian minister educate Roman Catholic children on the points upon which Protestants and Roman Catholics are agreed, which he may do at all hours he is very far from letting Popery alone."

These clear and in general very correct views respecting the common Christianity in the ordinary class

books of the National Board, are wound up by a declaration that it was by a special interference of Providence that the compilation of those books was entrusted to the Rev. Dr. Cullen, who impressed on them such a Protestant character.

"Why the Board, he says, intrusted this most important work to such a man, many would think it hard to say; but so it was, and I believe the hand of God to have been in it for good to his Church."—"Observations on National Education, by Rev. F. F. French."

Let us take another passage from the parliamentary report of 1837. The Rev. G. Campbell, of Trinity Church, Belfast, was examined, and in one of his answers he states—

"The Presbyterian mistress of Murphy-street National school informed me that some of the children refuse to receive the instruction which she gives, which consists of studying the Bible. If explanation of the Bible were given, she said there would be refusal, but during the lessons from the ordinary books of the Board, opportunities do occur, which can be and are taken advantage of to inculcate religious instruction without suspicion. She added 'Who is to take notice of this?'"

The same Rev. Mr. Campbell adds—

"The ordinary books contain religious instruction of a certain character, and to a certain extent, sufficient to give a teacher an opportunity of branching off from it, and giving peculiar religious instruction if so disposed."

Do not these testimonies of Rev. Mr. Campbell prove that there is no protection against proselytism for a Catholic child, under a Protestant teacher?

Dean Kennedy, a dignitary of the Protestant Church, was examined at the same time, and says—

"The Roman Catholics, in my National school, receive combined religious instruction in the Scripture Lessons, and are examined with the Protestants, who read the same portions of the Authorized Version; and I may mention that an opponent of the Board, and a friend of the Church Education Society, at the half-yearly examination of the children of my school, examined the classes, and himself awarded prizes for the best Scripture answering to Roman Catholic children. In my schools there are Roman Catholics receiving a greater amount of Scriptural education, through the medium of the sacred books of the National Board and the Scripture Lessons, than in any Church Education school that I know. This is my deliberate conviction."

And the Dean adds—

"I think the principles of the National Board are the principles of the Reformation."

I think it is clear from all this evidence there is very little protection in the guarantees now given by the Board that parental right will be respected. I must add, that in the same inquiry, Dean Howe, another dignitary of the Protestant Church, stated that in all the Catholic schools up to that time there had not been a single charge of attempted proselytism except in one case, and that case was not confirmed.

The opinions expressed by Protestant dignitaries show how difficult it must be to restrain them from proselytism. As an illustration, I quote a passage from a speech of the Right Rev. Dr. Daly, Bishop of Cashel and Waterford, delivered in the presence of the Protestant Primate and of a large assembly of noblemen and others on the 20th of April, 1843. He was arguing the National Board, and he says—

"I could, when I was minister of a large populous parish, have educated the Protestants of the parish efficiently and temperately, according to the tenets of the Established Church, under the system of the National Board, I could have taken care of the Protestants under that system."

One would think that this ought to have been enough, but nothing less than the attendance of the Catholic children at his instructions would satisfy him now. He adds—

"But I do trust that nothing, whether favour conferred or threats held out, will ever induce the Protestant clergy of Ireland to take part in a system which makes it a fundamental principle that notice is to be given to the Roman Catholic children to go away from the Word of the living God."



Feb. 24, 1852.  
His Honour  
Circuit  
Clerk.

The Church Education Society, in their various reports, have recorded the sentiments of Dr. Daly, May Presbyterians ministers have lately spoken in the same sense; and it would be easy to show, by other quotations, that the great end of their appointment is to secure the religious education of Catholic children. With what dangers then must not Catholic children be surrounded, when they attend mixed schools with Protestant teachers and managers?

Let us come now to the attendance of children of different religions at the same religious instruction. This common religious instruction was prohibited in the beginning, according to Lord Stanley's letter, to which I have frequently referred. In a letter addressed to the Rev. Mr. Love, a Presbyterian, in 1833, the Commissioners lay down this rule:—"That the Holy Scriptures might be read in his school, provided that such children only as are directed by their parents to attend be then allowed to continue in the school." And they then add—

"And that all others do retire; for it is the essence of the rule that children whose parents do not direct them to be present, should previously retire."

These same conditions were included in the "resolutions and directions" of the Commissioners in 1838.

"Any arrangement for religious instruction that may be made, it is to be publicly notified in the schools, in order that such children, and those only, may be present at the religious instruction whose parents or guardians approve of their being so."

The children were to be directed to attend by their parents, and the parents were to approve of their being present.

Mr. Bako, a Commissioner, one of the first, in his evidence before Parliament, in 1857, says—

"Our rule is perfectly clear upon the subject. The rule is that such children may attend as are authorised by their parents in doing so; and I consider it particularly necessary that the rule should require the approbation of the parent, for otherwise teachers might be placed, perhaps, on both sides, Protestant children might be induced to remain in the school while Roman Catholic children were being taught, as the child is left to choose, or not, at his discretion; and I should not consider the absence of dissent on the parent's part as a sufficient justification. Our object is, in short, both with respect to Protestants and Catholics, to prevent mixing the children of one communion with attendance upon religious instruction in being given to the other."

This shows that the Commissioners, and those who had a right to interpret the rules of the Commissioners, were decidedly of opinion, in the beginning, that children should not be allowed to attend at religious instruction given by a person of a different religion from their own, unless they were directed by their parents to do so, and unless their parents positively approved of their attendance.

This rule has been materially changed. In 1857 the rule was published in the following shape, at page 28 of the Fourth Report of the Commissioners of National Education:—"The letter of the rule is that religious instruction shall be given out of the hours during which all the children attending a school are assembled for common instruction." "The rule as to time was framed with a view to convenience, and to convenience only, and it never has been considered by us that we should violate principle if we allowed religious instruction to be given during the ordinary school hours, provided that such an arrangement was made as that children whose parents did not approve of it should not be required to attend or be present at it." Here the sense of the rule has been already changed. First it was required that parents should approve of the instruction to be given and direct their children to be present. That was a positive act on the part of the parents. According to the changed rule the children may attend, if the parents merely remain silent and do not express their disapproval or dissent.

The Report continues—"We, therefore, propose modifying the letter of the rule, so as to allow religious instruction to be given, and, of course, the Scriptures to be read, or the catechism learned, during any of the school hours, provided such an arrange-

ment be made as that no children shall take part in, or listen to, any religious reading or instruction to which their parents or guardians object." Here is another change permitting children to attend religious instruction different from their own, provided the parents do not object.

In 1840, however, the rule was completely changed, as we learn from the report of 1841. "So far, says the report, are we from prohibiting the use of the Scriptures, that we expressly recognise the right of all persons to have them used for the purpose of religious instruction in whatever way they may think proper, provided that each school be open to poor children of all communions; that due regard be had to parental right and authority; therefore that no child be compelled to attend, or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object." It is easy to see how different this rule is from the original instructions of the Board. In the beginning children were not to be present at any religious instruction of which the parents did not approve, or at which the parents did not direct them to attend. By the modified rule the only protection for children is that they are not to be compelled to attend at religious instruction, but it is left free to masters or managers to persuade or induce them to attend.

In the rule of 1841 there was still some little protection for children, but even that was removed by a further change in 1847, when the proviso do was introduced before the words be present at, and thus making these last words depend on the verb be compelled. "That no child be compelled to attend or to be present at." This little addition modified the system in regard to attendance at religious instruction most materially.

In the progress of years there were a great many discussions upon the matter, and it was soon found that the change was working in a very objectionable manner. To meet these objections the plan was proposed that the parents should get notice of religious instruction of a kind different from their own was given to their children. That was found also to be very little protection; and I think by the return on this matter, obtained by Mr. O'Reilly, it was found that a large number of Catholic children in the north of Ireland were attending religious instruction given by Presbyterians. The rule at present is that a notice-book is to be preserved in the schools and that no Catholic child is to attend religious instruction from Protestant teachers, and vice versa, unless the parent shall have previously signed a form preserved in that book, permitting the child to receive such instruction. But still, even as it is, this rule is liable to objection. Poor parents frequently will not understand the purport of the permission they have to sign, and teachers and managers can easily extort signatures from parents dependent on them. The present rule would be to hold as a matter of course that all poor Catholic parents wish to have their children educated in the Catholic religion unless they give positive instruction to the contrary.

These changes, as I have said before repeatedly, have excited a bad feeling against the Board, and made it be looked on with a great deal more jealousy than it was in the beginning.

We are not to be surprised that whilst tidings were in this unsettled state a wide door to proselytism should have been opened. In the report of 1839, p. 27, from which I read a paragraph the other day, it is stated by the Board that 1,816 Catholic children were reading the Protestant Bible in Protestant schools, or otherwise receiving Protestant education in schools under Protestant management.

Mr. Keenan, one of the Head Inspectors of the National Board stated, in a report carefully prepared by the National Board, that this practice was quite common.

"In all the schools which I visited in Belfast that were taught by Presbyterian teachers, the practice prevailed of giving common religious instruction to all, some of them retiring. Indeed, it is pretty general throughout the coun-

Feb. 24, 1869.  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

tion of Austria and Lombardy, but I never observed it to prevail in any other part of the country. By this practice religious instruction is separated as to time, but not as to the dissemination of the doctrine, and while religious instruction is going on, I have brought these different practices already under the notice of the Board in my ordinary reports."

On one yesterday I read for you a passage from a speech made by Mr. O'Reilly, M.P., in which he showed the different ways in which religious instruction was given by Presbyterians and others to Catholic children who frequented their schools in the north of Ireland: it is not necessary to repeat that passage. See Q. 26441.

I will now show how this mixed religious education was working against Catholics, according to the late Protestant Archbishop, Dr. Whately. Some very interesting and very important details on this subject are to be found in his life, published by Miss Whately, his daughter. The first passage I quote is taken from the first edition of the work, page 274:—

"The principle," he says, "upon which that (the Catholic) Church is constructed, the duty of unswerving submission to its authority, renders any doubt fatal. A man who is commanded not to think for himself, if he finds that he cannot avoid doing so, is unavoidably led to question the reasonableness of the command, and when he finds that the Church which claims a right to think for him, has preached doctrines, some of which are inconsistent, and others altogether at variance with the Gospels, he trusts in its infallibility, the foundation on which the whole system of faith is built, as on a rock."—p. 244.

Then he adds:—

"Such I believe to be the process by which the mind of a large portion of Roman Catholics have been prepared, and as a new law proposed for the recognition of Protestant doctrines. The education supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vital fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church."—p. 244.

Such were the effects of the mixed education given in the Scripture lessons and in the common reading books of the Board. According to Dr. Whately Catholics were induced to doubt about their religion, and consequently to lose their faith, and the vital fabric of the Catholic Church was gradually undermined. Can Catholics place any confidence in a system which its great founder declares to be most detrimental to their religion? The Archbishop writes elsewhere:—

"Six years ago, or more, I should have been inclined to doubt the possibility of having any instruction, or any examination in Scripture, that all the various denominations might possibly possess of. When Lord Stanley formed the Education Board, he had no such thought, and when Mr. Cullen proposed drawing up Scripture extracts, I partook of the same expectations with Bishop Philpotts, that as extracts could be introduced with the concurrence of all parties, such as should be of any utility. That I was as willing to have the experiment tried as he was to prevent it, and as much rejoiced as he was mortified and provoked at the unexpected success. I do not even now think my apprehensions groundless. The obstacles were incomparably greater than those to any analogous plan in England; and, lastly, a large number of the persons being themselves slightly acquainted with Scripture, could not be expected to look with a favourable eye on the study of any part of it by their flock. My apprehensions were, I still think, quite reasonable. The result, however, was completely unexpected. All the efforts to induce jealousy in the schools themselves, with reference to the Scripture extracts, have totally failed. They are read with delight and profit by almost all the children, and I and other Protestants, in Bishop Stanley's house, have examined the children of all denominations without knowing to which each child belonged, naming as I followed, and finding those better taught than most godless children."

These passages show the great facilities which were given by the changes in the rules to assist Catholic doctrine and to shake the faith of the poor children. When a Protestant archbishop and other Protestants were allowed to examine poor Catholic children in Scripture, who could prevent them from instilling their own opinions into the minds of the pupils. In another place he adds—there was some talk about making changes in the Board:—

"What I fear," said the Archbishop, "is a universal wish, though not universally expressed, may be so practically. I fear that a grant may be offered to any patron who will provide such secular education as the Government shall approve. If this be done, the schools in the Roman Catholic districts will be so many Maynooths, so many hotbeds of bigotry and religious animosity. Nor will the Protestant schools be much better. The great object of the teachers in each will be controversial theology, and secular instruction, and even moral instruction will be neglected. I believe, as I said the other day, that mixed education is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that, if we give it up, we give up the only hope of winning the Irish from the clutches of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I am, in fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, and behind me."—p. 246.

Here the archbishop, who in the published reports of the Board assures Catholics that there is no danger of proselytism, tells us that he is fighting against the abuses of Popery, and although he cannot openly assent to the Board as an instrument of conversion, yet he is doing so unobtrusively, and consequently making more dangerous incursions on Catholicity. He says in another place:—

"The control which it (the National system) gives is not perfect, but it is very great. It secures the diffusion of an amount of secular and religious instruction such as Ireland never enjoyed before in its institutions, and certainly would not enjoy if it were to be overthrown, and it prevents the diffusion of an amount of superstition, bigotry, intolerance, and religious animosity, I really believe, more extensive and more serious than any we have yet encountered."

In a pastoral charge delivered by Dr. Whately to the clergy of Kildare a very few weeks before his death, he repeats pretty much the same sentiments. He complains of the Protestant clergy for not having taken up with him the defence of the National Board, he says they lost a golden opportunity of diffusing amongst the great mass of the Irish people such an amount of Scriptural knowledge as they never so enjoyed before, and of banishing unscriptural darkness from the land. The following is the passage:—

"In order to keep clear of the above mentioned rivalry, the Irish Education Board, as you are doubtless well aware, published for the use of the National schools a large portion, both of the Old and of the New Testament, in a new translation, not strictly following either of the former versions. This obtained the unanimous sanction of all the Commissioners, both Protestant and Roman Catholic. And the publication comprised (besides a large portion of the Old Testament) the entire Gospel of Luke, and the whole book of the Acts. The sanction thus given to such a work, to be employed for the purpose of united education, was an event which suspended my most sanguine hopes. But, unluckily, an unwise correspondence for one Archbishop induced a large proportion of Protestants to decry the work and oppose its use still."

"The ultimate result of this opposition has been the virtual suppression of the work—a measure which could never have been carried but for this opposition. Thus was neglected and finally lost an opportunity which no one could have calculated on beforehand as likely to offer, and which no one can expect ever to return, a golden opportunity for diffusing among the great mass of the Irish people such an amount of Scriptural knowledge as they had never had before, nor ever likely to have another. If it be true, as is generally believed, that a large proportion of Romanists dread as unfavourable to their system, the general diffusion of Scriptural knowledge, though they are very unwilling openly to admit this, with what alarm these people must have seen the loss of I have been speaking of placed, with the sanction of thousands of their own Church, in the hands of hundreds of thousands of the youth of their communion, and with what wondering curiosity must they have seen the scheme defeated through the agency of Protestants! Of all the wonders (and there are not few or small) which have appeared in the last half century, this will probably be accounted by us in posterity as the most marvellous. They will regard it as a pity that above all others it was so unaccountable, that when a opening was afforded to Roman Catholics as well as to Protestants, under the sanction of Roman Catholic ministers, to obtain a large amount of Scriptural instruction—as an amount which probably would have led most of them, in after years, to the study of the entire Bible—the work should

have been strenuously and personally opposed, and finally defeated by Protestants, and that a whole generation, and probably all generations, should have been thus converted to unscriptural doctrines, through the efforts of persons whose (though entirely unknown) is the cause of Scriptural instruction.

I suppose no one could have understood better the bearings of the National system than Dr. Whately. He was his life and soul. He appears to have been the person who drew up its rules and principally effected the changes referred to. According to his deliberate opinion it was acting as a great engine for undermining and destroying the Catholic Church in Ireland, and upsetting the authority of the very persons who were engaged with him in carrying out the working of the system.

I think I have spoken sufficiently of the changes of the rules. Allow me now to call your attention to the various classes into which the schools may be divided, and to the way in which pupils are divided in them as reference to the various religious denominations. There are 2,305 schools, with 360,000 Catholic children attending them, and with no Protestant. So far as these schools are concerned I have no particular objection against them except that they are under undue restraint. They cannot use Catholic books, they cannot use Catholic emblems, the children in them are obliged to pass their whole time without learning anything about their own religion, or about the history of their own Church, or without paying any act of worship to God, without being able to venerate the holy Mother of God, or to do anything for their own sanctification during school-hours. Though the children are in no great danger as to their faith in such schools, yet they are obliged to sustain a great loss, and their religious principles may be weakened through the absence of prayer and good works.

There are besides 2,640 schools under Catholic teachers, with 320,000 Catholic children, and 24,800 Protestant children. These are the members on the roll, and so only about one-third attend, so, I suppose, in these 2,640 schools there are not more than about 8,000 Protestant children in attendance. Hence the number in each school must be very trifling indeed. As to the pupils in such schools under Catholic masters, though there is a very small mixture of Protestants, yet Catholics would have no great danger to apprehend, but, I think, Protestants would have a right to complain that in such schools they are not very likely to be safe. The example of the masters—even when the masters are determined to give them fair play, the example of the great bulk of the other children will have a great effect upon the religious opinions of such small minorities.

There are 132 really mixed schools, with 13,000 Catholics and 14,000 Protestants. All the objections which I made against mixed schools are to be directed against this portion of the schools of the National Board. The two first classes of schools are mixed in name, but not mixed in reality. These are mixed in principle and in practice, and are the more dangerous on that account.

There are 107 Protestant schools with no Catholics but with 19,000 Protestant pupils. I have no objection whatsoever to schools conducted in that way.

Then, there are 1,039 schools, under Protestant managers and teachers, with 29,500 Catholics in them, and 115,000 Protestants. This is a class of schools to which I object very much, and which, I think, must produce great evils. They exhibit the mixed system both in practice and principle, and are subject to all the dangers with which that system is accompanied. The example, and the numbers of the Protestant children, and the tendency of the teaching, must contribute to shake Catholic convictions, and wear children, as Dr. Whately says, from their attachment to their own Church.

27046 The *Chapman*.—Are the last class of schools to be found least except in Ulster?—Why in this part of the country there are very few Protestants in the National schools. I have brought with me an account

given to me by Mr. Keenan, of the National schools in the city of Dublin. Under Roman Catholic clerical and conventional management, there are 60 schools given in this return, in which there are 24,303 Catholic children, 4 Jews, and 6 Protestants. Now as where there are 10 children on the rolls, there are not more than 3 in daily attendance, according to the general average of the Board, so we can conclude that not more than 3 Protestants or Jews are daily to be found in the 60 schools, or 1 in every 20 schools, yes in consideration of that fraction of a Protestant, tens of thousands of Catholics must give up the practices and emblems of their faith. Besides the Catholic children referred to, over 4,000 others attend the schools of the Christian Brothers in the diocese of Dublin, which are not at all in connexion with the Board. Other convent schools that are not in connexion with the Board, give education to perhaps 4,000 other children. Then there is a great number of other schools of a somewhat higher class not included in the return, so that I should say there are at least 36,000 Catholic children in Dublin attending purely Catholic schools, under Catholic managers, and Catholic teachers, and altogether Catholic. So as far as that goes it is very satisfactory, and gives a clear proof that the people of this city are not prepared for mixed education. In the county Dublin there are, under clerical and convent managers, 110 schools, with 16,531 Catholic children, and a mixture of only 85 Protestants. There is not 1 Protestant for each of these schools in the county Dublin. In the county Wicklow, of which a great part is in this diocese, there are more Protestants in proportion to the whole population, than in any other county parts of the diocese. In the part of the county Wicklow belonging to this diocese, there are 36 schools under Catholic, clerical, and convent managers, with 5,752 Catholic children, and only 762 Protestant children. In the part of the county Kildare which belongs to this diocese there are, under Catholic, clerical, and convent managers, 32 National schools, with 4,361 Catholic children, and 46 Protestant children. So that altogether in this part of the country the mixture is so small, that it is scarcely to be taken into account. I suppose in the south and west of Ireland it is the same or less than it is in the east of Dublin. The only really mixed schools are the model and training schools, which, however, would not long maintain their mixed character were it not for the great amount of money expended on them, and the efforts made to attract children to them.

27047 With regard to the city of Dublin—in not the absence of the Protestant element from schools under the Board to be accounted for by the fact that the Protestants are largely educated in schools of the Church Education Society?—Of course, the absence of the Protestant element may be explained by the fact alluded to, but still their absence shows that the Protestants of Dublin are not favourable to mixed education. As to the Church Education schools, I think the number of children in them is not great, but they and the Protestant parish schools are purely denominational.

27048 Mr. Deane.—In the places where the Protestants reside, are these schools available for them?—In every parish there are parochial or other schools for Protestants alone, so that both Protestants as well as Catholics show their desire for separate education.

I shall now come to the model schools—schools very important and very expensive. The first objection against the schools of this class is, that they are founded on the mixed system, and that would make them always objectionable to the great bulk of the people of this country—to the Catholic bishops, and Catholic clergy, and the great mass of the Catholic people. In connexion with these model schools there are training schools which, I think, are of a most objectionable character. These training schools are a sort of mixed boarding-schools, for Protestants, Catholics, and Presbyterians. Young men of every religion, live together in the same houses, and are trained up together. They are left with very little religious teaching, and I think very little care is taken

Feb 24. 1869.  
His Excellency  
General  
Coles.

Feb. 24, 1869.  
His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

to make them practice any religion. I heard on some occasion that if one of the young men in some of these establishments would attempt to say his prayers, he would be laughed at or looked by others. Young teachers cannot be well treated in such establishments. Mr. O'Reilly, in a speech delivered in Parliament on the 15th of May, 1866, gives a very fair account of the effects of such a system. I quote from *Hansard*, page 1918. His words are—

"Such a system (referring to training schools) could not be maintained—not to mention particular scandals to which it had given rise—he would state its effect in respect to *Parliament*. He did not say these training schools were hotbeds of *Protestantism*; but many of these superficially-educated young men were connected with *Protestantism*, while several of the informants as to the movements of the conspirators, had been diabolists who had been carefully trained in the model schools. On the other hand, the schools of the *Christian Brothers* contained about 50,000 pupils, but there was no show that any educated by them, with the exception of one young lad who had left their schools at the age of eleven, had been trifled with in the *Emancipation*. In the central training school, there was actually established a lodge of *Knights*. *Freemasonry*, and one young woman sent out a large box of offerings from that school to the *Chicago Fair*, which was held in the interests of the *Protestants*."

It is a very dangerous thing to have a number of young men living together without great control, without being under constant and dissuasive, and without receiving a good deal of religious instruction.

Besides being badly provided with religious education, we must find that the training schools are deficient in some important branches of literary teaching. Take history for example. Dr. Whately, in one of his conversations, says—

"To say that a man can have gone through a course of liberal education in this country, totally ignorant of the contents of *Christian history*, is to imply not only that the *Christian religion* is untrue or bad, but that it is insignificant and unworthy of serious attention except for those who have a fancy for it."

Now the training schools have no class of history, and leave their pupils without any knowledge of the history of their religion, or of the history of their country, and I think they merit the reproach of Dr. Whately against those who neglect history. That history is neglected, is proved, by the evidence of the *Inspector*. Mr. Butler, having examined 904 masters, reports—

"The knowledge of history possessed by our teachers is very limited: in few parts of the country more they were deficient. Yet the outline contained in the Fifth Book, although it is unsatisfactory, and in many respects defective, particularly with regard to modern and English history, would, if studied with ordinary attention and industry, make them acquainted with the dates at which they occurred, and some of the principal passages who bore a part in them. The study of history and chronology has been too much neglected in our schools, and it would soon be advisable to have the omissions repaired."

Dr. Newell, now joint Secretary, reported, as *Hon. Inspector*, in reference to 202 masters examined by him—

"Of history, the National teachers as a body, are more ignorant than, perhaps, any other class of persons in Ireland who have received the usual extent of instruction. This ignorance of history is, in some cases, intelligible. It is only the teachers of the first and second classes (who form only about one third of the whole number) that we required to know history, and the only text book they use is the Fifth Lesson Book which, being a mere compendium, with facts and dates, is not easily remembered. I think it very much to be regretted that the National teachers of Ireland are so ignorant of the history of ourselves and of general literature."

Mr. Keenan, a Catholic, now one of the Chiefs of Inspection, writing somewhat later than the other *Hon. Inspectors*, thus expresses his views—

"History may be said to be entirely neglected in our National schools. The meagre outline of the subject contained in our Fifth Book are arranged in no consecutive form, that few teachers or pupils ever study them carefully. Probably the history of no country can be written without

creating some disagreeable propositions; but this affords no reason for the entire suppression of the study of the subject. In most Continental countries, the two leading thoughts of an education are to make the grounds of the language and the leading features of the history of the state the groundwork and the essentiality of an elementary school course."

Let me here add the National school books are sadly deficient in regard to Irish history. Our history is not so disreputable as to be unfit to be studied by children, yet in all the books of the National Board there is scarcely a page of Irish history—there is scarcely a page, at all events, worthy to be called Irish history, or anything like Irish history. There were very many great men in Ireland in former times. There were a great many distinguished men in later times—*Beaumont, Sheridan, Swift, Grattan, and O'Connell, Shiel, Dr. Doyle, and many others*, their names never occur in the historical parts of the books of the National Board. As to our great Irish poets and mystics, of course they may not be mentioned but it should be supposed that their names were held in veneration in their native land. Thus often regarding the Church of Ireland, the saints and missionaries of Ireland who rendered such services to religion and civilization on the Continent of Europe, and our great poets, orators, and statesmen, it is worthy of the severest reprobation. Our history speaks much that is glorious for our country, and children should not be left in ignorance of it.

Before I leave the model or training schools I must observe that the training consists, I understand, of two courses each year. Some of the young teachers remain for four months, and others for six months, at the school in Dublin. They enter without high qualifications, and they cannot make great progress in the time of their training. Four months are not sufficient to give a sufficient training to any man who is to teach others. I think the system adopted by the National Board is very defective on that head. I was looking over, some time ago, the rules regarding training schools in France, and I saw it laid down that every teacher must pass three years in these schools before he is allowed to teach a public school. Here at home the *Christian Brothers* oblige the young members of their institute to go through a probation of several years to prepare them to teach. It is on this account that they are so successful in their schools.

When speaking the other day about the agricultural schools in Ireland, I mentioned that they were generally of very little value to the country. I said so, at the same time, that one good agricultural school affording proper training and proper instruction upon everything connected with agriculture, would be very useful, and I have heard that the *Glennview* model agricultural school is rather successful at present. But as long as it remains a mixed school, it will be always very objectionable. As to the small model agricultural schools through the country, I believe many of them are of very little value. I do not object to small farms of three or four, or five acres, held by schoolmasters if they be in any way industrious or skilful, for example may be beneficial in the parts of the country in which they live. What I wished to disprove were the intermediate agricultural schools.

Having said so much about the training schools, I will just say regarding the model schools in general, that in the first place they are exceedingly expensive. The central establishments in *Marlborough-street* cost—according to the *Parliamentary Reports*—for getting up the buildings, £113,368. The district model schools cost £154,130, and for repairs, £12,173. The farming schools cost £82,435, being altogether, with some other items, about £262,075 expended upon the model and farming schools. That is an enormous amount of money when we compare it with the little good which is done by these schools. If that sum had been expended in building ordinary schools through the country, a great deal of service would have been done, and we would not have so many complaints about the bad accommodation in the

Feb. 24, 1869.  
 His Honor  
 the Lord  
 Chief Justice

schools as there are at present. Besides that, it appears that the annual expense of the model and training schools in Marlborough-street, is £2,245. For all the other model schools, \$26,000, and for the agricultural schools, £5,825; and the Board of Works receives for repairing them \$10,135, making a total of £90,945. The number of children attending these schools is about 8,300. A great number of them are infants—so young that they are not able to learn much—and still the expense of all the children and persons attending these model schools, amounts to nearly 26 per head. The amount per head varies in the different schools. At the Inchicore school, just outside Dublin, the expense for each child is £5 3s 3d per annum. In the several schools quite close, where the education is perhaps better, and in other similar schools, the expense is only 4s. per head per annum. In the model school in Marlborough-street, the annual cost is £2 11s per head. In the west Dublin model school, £1 4s. At Rensselaer, it goes up to £11 per head. At Athy, in this diocese, it is 7s 7d. At Kilkenny, also in this province, it is £9 19s. per head. At Gal way, £5 19s., and at Sligo, £4 1s. per head. Now, looking at the question in a financial point of view, it is evident that there is a great waste of money on these schools, which should not be encouraged or permitted to continue any longer.

There is another matter connected with these model schools worth mentioning. I understand there are good teachers in the schools at Marlborough-street, but I am decidedly impressed that a great number of the children receive a very inferior education. Some smart, intelligent boys are taken great care of—but there are great numbers of children neglected. Last summer, when I was expecting to be committed here, I applied to the Christian Brothers to know if they had any more of boys who had been at their schools, then went to the model schools, and after words returned, and if they could state what progress these boys made while at the model schools. I was furnished with a return, from which I find that, in the Christian Brothers' schools in Rensselaer-street, there were seventy boys who had been in the model school. At St. Mary's school, near the Black Church, there were forty-three such boys, and at St. Laurence's schools twenty two, making a total of 133 boys in schools in this parish, and in St. Laurence's, who had been in some time in Marlborough-street schools. The return gives the age of each boy, the length of time he had been in Marlborough-street, and the progress he had made. I will read two or three instances.

21042 The Chairman.—We do not think it necessary to have the names given.—Very well, the names may be omitted. Y. F. had been at Marlborough-street for three years and a half, and entered at the age of seven years, made very little progress. B. G., formerly a pupil in St. Laurence's Christian Brothers' schools, having learned the principal part of one large arithmetic, two books of geometry, and some book-keeping, left for the model schools in Marlborough-street. After having been there nearly three years, part of which he was engaged as a paid monitor, he returned to St. Laurence's, and reported the aid of some of his former school-fellows, who had been so below him when he left, to work some of the ordinary sums of practice. (Other ones read.) Though the expense for each pupil is very heavy, the teaching is not, it would appear, very successful. I understand the masters are all well educated men, but they are not as successful as the Christian Brothers or the Nuns in teaching their schools.

There is another feature, I think, very objectionable in model schools. They are frequented very much by respectable children who could afford very well to pay for themselves. I have learned, on very good authority, that in some parts of the country children who are able to pay for yearly tickets on railroads go in from five and six miles in order to be present at the teaching or lectures in the model school. Such persons ought to go to boarding schools; they ought not to be situated at the expense of the country.

In the towns, shopkeepers who could very well afford to pay for their children, tradesmen, and often-times attorneys, and persons who follow professions, send their children to the model schools, and get them educated gratuitously, whereas they ought themselves to pay for the education of their children.

There is another subject connected with the National Board to which I referred already, but it is of so much importance that I return to it, that is, the character of the books. We learn from a parliamentary return obtained by Mr. Moseley the names of the persons who compiled these books. The first and second books of lessons were compiled by the Rev. James Carile and Dr. McArthur, his relative. Second book revised in 1844 by the Most Rev. Dr. Whately. *Sequel No. I* and *No. II* were compiled by the Most Rev. Dr. Whately and some of his Grace's family. The Rev. Dr. Carile describes the manner in which the books were compiled. I never heard of books being prepared for school in such a way. When examined before the Parliamentary Committee in 1837, Dr. Carile was asked:—

"Who has compiled these elementary books to which you are now referring?" He answered—"The mode of their compilation was this. I had a school under my own management in which I had four or five teachers; I brought them together and consulted them on the subject, and suggested a plan for the formation of the books; some amongst them undertook the compilation of them. These were the teachers of my school, with the Head Master of the school, who is now the Head Master of our Model school.

"Sergeant Jackson asks:—'You are to be understood to say, all the elementary books have been produced in that way by the teacher of your school, and revised by yourself?'—Along with the Head Teacher (Rev. Mr. Carile's relative) of our school, who had been a teacher of my school, and they have all been submitted to the Board.

"It being the fact that you have introduced religious matters throughout the books: do you think the combined instruction under the National Board is adequately described by the terms 'moral and literary instruction?'—If the terms 'moral and literary' are meant to exclude religious, I should say not; but I think it would there must be a reference to the great foundations of all morals, religion.

"You are not prepared to state that it is merely moral and literary instruction?—If by that it is meant to exclude religious, it is not."

Rev. Mr. Carile further explained to the committee, that—

"Every subject brought forward in the reading lessons must be explained, and the master is expected to be able to answer the questions the children may put to him, and he cannot do that without considerable information."

That shows how the books were compiled. Teachers or under-teachers, Scotch and Protestant, assembled together and executed these books, containing scriptural extracts, and religious matters, for the Catholic people of Ireland. Such a thing had never occurred in any other country before. Then several of the books were compiled by Dr. Whately, the Protestant Archbishop, and members of his family, and these books, containing much religious matter, were also destined for the use of a Catholic population. As regards Carile's scripture lessons, they have been long since banished from Catholic schools, and as to Dr. Whately's lessons on Christianity, no Catholics now read them, and they have been condemned by the Holy See.

But referring to another instance, some of the very elementary books have a great deal of matter in them which is totally unfit for poor children. I opened one of them the other day, and in the very index I found the following matters proposed for the children:—Third order of Birds, *Semotus*; fourth order of Birds, *Razores*; fifth order of Birds, *Gallatones*; sixth order of Birds, *Natationes*. Then we find *Quadrupeds*, *Quadrumania*, *Plantigrade*, *Marsupial*, *Digigrade*, *Rodentia*, *Edentata*, *non-Ruminant*, or *Pachydermata*. Probably a poor child meeting all these hard words, would be very much tempted to throw the book into the fire, and never read a word again.

The same little book, *Sequel No. 2*, contains no in-

Feb. 24, 1863.

His Honour  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

structions of any value that a person would wish a child should reflect. It could be put into the hands of pagans without injury to their principles, but I think Christian children can derive very little benefit from a book in which there is no reference, or scarcely any reference to religion.

In this same book, No. 2, compiled by Dr. Whately, there is a chapter on the National schools written in order to make the children very fond of them, and of the Government that supports them. It is there stated "that the Government—that is, those who govern in the Queen's name, get leave of the Parliament—that is, the gentlemen who are chosen to overlook the Government, and watch over the concerns of the people, to set apart a sum of money for building schools, paying teachers, and other expenses belonging to them; but the number of schools required is so great, that this money would not be sufficient, unless the gentry gave their help towards it, and a number of them do give ground, and pay part of the expenses when they find that a school is wanted in their neighbourhood." That passage is calculated to make a false impression on the minds of the children. The greater number of the schools in Ireland have been built by the poor themselves, or the middle classes, or the few Catholic gentry we have, but the great mass of the gentry and the Government have contributed little or nothing to the building of the National schools.

In the Second Book, which I have here, matters are introduced which give great room to mistakes or to teach directly their own religious opinions. I will read first one passage about the fall of Adam—

"Then an evil spirit who is called the devil, spoke falsely to Eve, and said, 'Ye shall not surely die.' And he said her that on that day they should eat of that tree, the good things were to know good and evil. So Eve gave one to the devil and when she loved that this fruit was law to the eye, and good for food; and that it was a fruit to make one wise, she took of it, and did eat it, and gave also to Adam, and he did eat."

"Now, when the Lord God saw what they had done, He sent them away from Eden, and told them that they must hereafter support themselves by their labour; and that they should do, in the course of years, and become that again. But in His goodness, He gave them hope, that in due time, one would be born from the children of Eve, who should conquer the evil one, by whom she had been tempted. And so it was, our Lord Jesus Christ, born of the children of Eve, came into the world to do for us, and teach us how to be good, and so to conquer that evil one, and He will give us a better dwelling-place than Eden was when we did, if we do His will."

This passage, which purports to give an account of the fall of man, and the promise of a Redeemer, whilst it omits everything, introduces things not in conformity with Scripture. There is nothing in it to show the depravity of our Lord, or his character as a lawgiver, or the infinite value of his sufferings, by which he satisfied for our sins. He is said to be born of the children of Eve, why not use the Gospel phrase that the Redeemer was born of the Virgin Mary? Was the woman unwilling to let children know who the mother of God is, and what her name? The words regarding our first parents, "If thou the Lord obey what they had done, he said them away," may give children ground to believe that the fall of man was a very small thing, that it was something like the fault of a boy who, having been detected stealing apples, is driven out by the gardener. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is that by disobedience our first parents contracted original guilt, and that they transmitted that guilt to their posterity; that our Lord was sent as a true Redeemer and born of the Blessed Virgin Mary, that he was true God and true man, that because into the world to die for us, and to reveal to us the doctrines of heaven and the precepts of morality, and to prepare for us an opening to heaven, if we act according to his precepts and believe his doctrines. The passage just quoted offers a ready occasion for introducing doctrines contradictory to those of the Catholic Church.

There is another passage which I happened to hit

on, it is an account of the offering made by Melchisedech when he met Abraham. The words are—

"And the king of Salem who was also a priest of the most high God, went out to meet him, and blessed him. And Abram gave him a tenth part of all that he had taken in the war."

These words from Second Book, page 80, edition of 1862, are given differently in other editions, but it does not appear by what authority those changes are made. The only remark I shall make is that Catholics hold that Melchisedech offered a sacrifice of bread and wine to the Most High, and that it was a type of the sacrifice which Catholics believe to be offered on the altar in the sacrifice of the mass. Hence the omission of all reference to bread and wine where the history of Melchisedech's sacrifice is given, is an occult attack on the Catholic doctrine, and a means of making children ignore the sacrifice of the mass. At all events the passage would give an opportunity to a Protestant teacher to undermine Catholic faith.

Let us take up the Fourth Book. At page 52, is a chapter on history, we read—

"The people of these islands have one and the same language (all, at least, who are educated), one and the same Queen—the same laws; and though they differ in their religious opinions, they all serve the same God, and call themselves by the name of Britons."

This passage intimates that no one who speaks Irish is educated.

17956. The Chieftains.—Or Welsh!—Or Welsh, or Scotch. I believe there are a great many well educated men in Ireland, plenty in Wales—more again in Scotland, who speak the respective languages of their own countries. I do not think the children ought to be taught such things. The passage adds, that England and Ireland have "the same laws." That is not correct. There are a great many laws in Ireland which are not adopted in England—and many laws in England which we have not in Ireland. The last words tend to make children believe that all the inhabitants of these islands profess in substance the same religion, whilst in reality there are essential differences between the doctrines of Catholics and Protestants. The edition I quote from is of 1867.

At page 54 it is said—"At a village called Glasnevin, near Dublin, is an institution for the deaf and dumb, to teach them to talk on their fingers, read and write, and many other things." The institution referred to is a Protestant proselytizing school for deaf and dumb children. Many poor Catholics are taken into it, and educated in better hostility to the faith of their fathers. It is a very sad example that the education of the Catholic children of Ireland should be called to such a place as that it was one of the wonders of Dublin. I think also that in a book published in 1867 it ought not to have been mentioned to the exclusion of the two admirable institutions for deaf and dumb which are at Calcutta—one for boys and the other for girls—which are infinitely more important and which do much more credit to the country than that at Glasnevin.

Then the book goes on to give an account of strikes. A poor child reading this would think the people of Ireland were always engaged in strikes, and that they had no such thing in other countries. Whereas there are, I believe, more strikes in England and America than in Ireland.

The next piece of information the book gives is that in the province of Ulster "a large proportion of the people here are of Scotch descent, and have some of the thifty and industrious habits of Scotland." The same is to say that in other parts they have not thifty and industrious habits. Then, lest the poor children should think that formerly there was any intemperance or any morality in Ireland, it is added—"The people of Ireland are a clever, lively people, formerly very much given to drink and very ignorant."

Let us go on to another chapter of the same book. Recollect what I am about to read is published in the year 1867. Speaking of Genoa, it says—"Crossing a branch of the Appennines one comes to Genoa, &

town on the Mediterranean, which belongs as does Padua to the kingdom of Sardinia."—Fourth Book, p. 97. In 1867 there was no such thing as a "Kingdom of Sardinia."

In the next page, 98, speaking about Rome, it says—"You may remember that Judea belonged to the Romans in the time of the Apostles, and that St Paul was brought prisoner to Rome, where he preached the Gospel for two years." It is strange that when Rome is described the mention should be made of St. Paul in a book destined for Catholic children. His name is very suspicious, especially as St. Paul is brought forward so conspicuously. St. Peter was in Rome and died in Rome, and all Catholics believe he placed his See in Rome, and that the Pope was his successor. Why should all that be omitted?

"But Rome, though still a beautiful and interesting city, is not what it was. Much of it has fallen into ruins, and the country round, which was once cheerful and highly cultivated, is now so unwholesome that no one wishes to live in it in the summer time, so that it is left quite a desert."

I believe Tacitus, speaking somewhere of the Vallum Hill, says that a Roman legion that surrounded was, as a punishment, stationed "in *iniquam aere fatuam*." So that at that time the very neighbourhood of Rome was unwholesome, and anyone acquainted with the climate must recollect many passages from which it appears that the climate of the country round Rome was such as it is at present. If the last part of the sentence means that Rome is deserted in summer, it is altogether incorrect. The country is very much deserted, but the city is quite as populous in summer as in winter.

It is added regarding Italy in general—"this is in 1867." Italy is divided into a number of States, with different Governments, chiefly despotic. The only two Governments in it are those of the King of Italy and the Pope: one of these governments is constitutional, the other paternalist and despotic.

At page 190—speaking of the history of the Jews—"we read, 'David's reign was long and glorious,' but then it is added 'But God's moral law or the practice of virtue was very little known on the earth, even among the Israelites, to whom it had been taught by Moses more than 400 years before.' I think that is not at all true, and it ought not to be set out as a great fact of history before the poor children who frequent the National schools. Speaking about the prophets it is said,—

"They (the prophets) seem to have increased in number and importance still after the captivity of the Jews, when it pleased God to withdraw from them this mode of supernatural instruction, and leave them to their sacred writings."

Some of the last of the prophets lived after the captivity, as Malachi and Haggai, so, even according to the Protestant catalogue of the books of Scripture, the statement I have quoted is false. But then, besides that, Catholics receive as canonical several inspired and prophetic works, which were written long after that period.

There is an article on salvation at page 195, which treated great dissensions between Catholics and Protestants even in Australia—for it appears the Board is now sending away its old books to that distant region, and introducing them into the National schools. I read shortly from the Catholic Bishop of Montreal, in which he considers this chapter on Christian salvation, and states that he resented the introduction of the book into Catholic schools. The chapter is a long one, but every word would give room for commentary, and every word either suggests anti-Catholicism, or gives an opportunity to Protestant masters to mislead them.

At page 259 there is a story of "Catherine of Liverpool," a mere Methodist legend, and I think it ought not have been put into the hands of Catholics who believe in the authority of the Church, and in the efficacy of sacraments. Then there is *Jesus on the desert*, page 317, entitled "Terrible incident on a missionary voyage to the Sandwiches." It is quite evident the missionary was a Protestant, and I think

the compilers of the book might have had the good taste not to put this story into the hands of Catholic children. Not only the lives of saints but even their very names are excluded from our schools. Why then should the exploits of Methodists or other Protestants be introduced? Catholic children are thus deprived of the knowledge of what would edify, but their attention is called to things either condemned by or not consonant with their own religion.

I now turn to a book lately published for the use of girls. Having looked over the greater part of it, I think there is scarcely a word in it about religion from beginning to end. Girls are taught how to perform every possible temporal duty, but there is not a word about saying their prayers, or about obeying the laws of the Gospel, or anything of that kind. It is a book that could have been very well written by any of the old pagans.

I now come to the Fifth Book of Lessons; it contains a description of the globe, and a short geography, in which Ireland is not mentioned at all, nor is there the least reference to its geological or physical characteristics. There are twenty-six pastoral pieces in the book, not one written by a Catholic or an Irishman—and they are pieces of no great merit. There are 124 pages of history in which mention is made only twice of Ireland, in a chronological table, at page 167. The first mention of Ireland is as follows—"Henry the Second of England received the submission of the Irish kings." The date is not given, but the fact is referred to the twelfth century. The next mention of Ireland is in the year 1800, where we read—"Union of Great Britain and Ireland." That is all the account given of Ireland in a book of a considerable size, and prepared for the education of Irish children. At page 202, speaking of the sixteenth century, it says:—

"The age, so fertile in great events, was also the age of the Reformation, in which the Protestant Churches separated from the Church of Rome—an event which still continues to influence the political affairs of Europe."

In the beginning of this century, the eyes of all Europe were turned towards the newly discovered continent of America and its schools. All this attention was called off by a new object of a different description, namely, the dissemination of the doctrines of the Reformation, followed by the struggle for civil liberty that immediately ensued. The crowned heads of Europe regarded the introduction of any political or religious doctrine into their dominions, without their consent, as a dangerous encroachment on their power and prerogative, and aided by arms of the clergy and army of the day, attempted to crush every such tendency to innovation. Hence arose wars, persecutions, proscriptions, and massacres, scarcely less terrible than those which stain the pages of ancient pagan history."—Fifth Book of Lessons, p. 202, of year 1689.

This passage intimates much that is false and injurious to Catholics. According to the real facts of history, the princes themselves were the persons who introduced the principles of the Reformation, or aided in introducing them—Henry the Eighth in England, Christian in Denmark, Gustavus Wasa in Sweden, and others elsewhere, forced the people to embrace the new doctrine, and persecuted those who adhered to the old faith. Hence, the account of the rise of the Reformation given in the school book is very unfair, and well calculated to make Catholic children less than respect for their own Church.

I passed over a passage at page 183, which I now wish to refer to. Speaking of Constantine, it says:—

"He became professedly a Christian, and his accession drew multitudes into the Church, many of whom at all probability knew little of Christianity, beyond the name."—Fifth Book, p. 183, of year 313.

I do not think the statements made in this passage are true—even if they were true, I do not think they should be insinuated upon the minds of young persons. Constantine became a true Christian, not a professing one merely. There were great multitudes of Christians at that time who suffered persecution for their religion, and who knew their religion better perhaps than those who wrote this commentary upon their knowledge of it.

FIG. 24, 1689.

His Emancipation  
Catholic  
Catholics

Feb. 24, 1852.  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

In the next page, 187, it is stated—"Julian openly embraced paganism. From this circumstance he has acquired the name of the Apostate. He did not, however, persecute the Christians." That is not correct. What is added contradicts the statement. "He did not, however, persecute the Christians—had he observed that persecution only increased their numbers—he, therefore, attacked them by more subtle means, by fomenting quarrels among them, by discomfiting them, by encouraging and favouring paganism, and by reviving the pagan worship, which had fallen into disuse in all its splendour," &c. All that was most subtle persecution. He persecuted them by forbidding them to study or teach literature, and by encouraging dissensions among them; he also had recourse to violence and the sword, sending Christians into exile and putting some to death. The general belief is that, if he had returned from his expedition against the Persians, he would have persecuted the Christians with as much cruelty as any former emperor. All this is in the "Fifth Book of Lessons," published in 1845, which, I suppose, is one of the "Revised Editions."

I now take up the "Fourth Book of Lessons," printed in 1847. This is a late publication, and I believe there are a great many very good things in it, but it also contains things quite unfit for children, thus there are fourteen chapters on Political Economy written by Dr. Whately in hard language, and founded on very abstract, perhaps sophistical reasoning. I am sure poor little children of eight or nine or ten years of age, such as the great majority of the pupils are in the National schools, will not be greatly interested by these chapters. Men advanced in years, and accustomed to business, are scarcely able to penetrate into the mysteries of political economy—especially when the science is put in an obscure manner as in this book. What profit can children derive from reading such treatises? The principles of that science are not generally admitted by all. The Commissioners might have applied with propriety in this case that doctrine that everything not acceptable to all their conferees should be excluded from their class-books.

I have seen it mentioned in a Parliamentary paper that some gentlemen objected to passages in this book and, that the passages thus objected to have been struck out; however, they remain in the copy in my hands. One of the passages objected to is a very harmless one. It is found at page 173, "The good lady"—this was Queen Philippa of England—"made the sign of the cross on her breast, and having recommended to God the king and her youngest son, Thomas, who was present, gave up her spirit, which I firmly believe was caught by the holy angels and carried to the glory of heaven." There is not anything objectionable in that passage, and I do not see why Catholic children should be prevented if they wished to read it. But the fact shows the difficulty of carrying out mixed education: the system will not allow a harmless passage, such as that we have read, merely stating an edifying scene to stand in a book destined for the use of six or seven hundred thousand Catholic children, and it will not tolerate the least reference to the sign of the cross, though St. Paul says—"About mid-glitter, and in vultu Domini n. Joan. Chrysost.".

I now come to the Supplement to the Fourth Book of Lessons, this is an old book, published in 1851, but I got it in a school a few weeks ago. There are many original pieces in it, none of which appear to have been written by Jesuits or Catholics. At page 41 there is a chapter on superstition, which, though it does not expressly teach Catholic doctrine, still throws a slur on them indirectly. At page 128 there is a chapter on lying, which, I think, contains many things not sound in theology. It says in the first piece, "Those who have not the courage to speak out the truth boldly and boldly, try to escape from its consequences by concealing it; but they defeat their own purpose, for a liar is generally detected sooner

or later." "The most important thing is that lying is a vice peculiarly displeasing to God. We are commanded by Him to speak every man truth with his neighbour." On these passages it is to be observed that a man may conceal the truth without being a liar; we are never allowed to tell lies, but we are not commanded to tell on all occasions what the truth is to others. We may hold our tongues when we do not want to tell what we think, is others. The writer adds—"We may say things which are not entirely false, but may bear a double meaning, or are true in themselves, but not true in the sense in which our hearers understand us, in which case we lead people to believe what is false." This is called equivocation, and, in fact, is to all intents and purposes the same as a lie and equally criminal." This teaching is not correct, and such doctrines ought not to be infused into the minds of children. There is a story told in ecclesiastical history of St. Athanasius, a very great saint and a very learned theologian, profoundly versed in Scripture. He was dying from his persecutors up the Nile on one occasion; his enemies following him to put him to death. When he found that he could not escape them, he turned the boat towards his persecutors, and when they asked "Do you know where is Athanasius?" he said, "He is not far from you." The persecutors then rowed on most rapidly in order to overtake him. According to this lesson the saint would have been a liar. But such a course would be most unjust, and I think any other Christian, in the same circumstances, would have acted as St. Athanasius did if he had the same presence of mind.

Though it is wearisome to be going over these little things, yet, as they show the character of the work, I will refer to page 26 (Book 4th, 1851), where there is some account of the life of Obadiah, a Huguenot pastor of Widdblack, in the Rue de la Roche. There are two chapters concerning him. He may have been a good man; yet, when the Commissioners would not allow in their books the life of a persecuted saint, I do not see why they should introduce the memoirs of a French Calvinist minister.

Further on there is another long story from page 330 to 360, entitled "The Foster Parents and the Foster Child." It appears to be a Methodist story. All the parties concerned appear to have lived without prayer or sacraments, and without going to mass or to church; at their death an minister of religion visited us, yet, with such antecedents, we are told that they died in the faith of Christ, and in the hope of resurrection. Such examples are anything but edifying for Catholic children. At page 253 there is a "Biography of John Ponsard," who must have been a Methodist, but whose life does not give any notion of faith or of anything supernatural.

In this book there are fifty pages, at least, of history, and no mention of Ireland, except that Henry II. took possession of it, and there is not a single reference to the Catholic Church and its history, or to any of the leading mysteries of Christianity, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Death of our Saviour. Such works ought not to be forced on a Catholic country. I know it is said the use of these books is not made compulsory, but it is virtually so, because they are printed at the expense of the country, and are sold very cheap in such circumstances poor people will not buy any others. I pass over many other objections which could be alleged against the National school-books, but what I have said is sufficient to show that these books are not of real value, and that they are not suited to Catholic children. I would have Catholic books for Catholic children, at least without any evasion against Catholic doctrine; and I would let others have books for themselves, and have these according to their own particular opinions, just as they have in other countries, as in England, in France, and in Prussia.

37031. The *Catechism*.—Is there any other point which your Eminence would wish to extend your observations?—There are two other matters I wish to refer



to—the Christian Brothers and the schools conducted by them. The Christian Brothers are closely connected with the question of primary education in Ireland. They were founded in the beginning of this century, about the year 1802. Since then they have extended themselves very much. They were connected with the National Board at the commencement, but afterwards, when they would not be allowed to carry on their own system, they separated from it. At present they have sixty distinct establishments in Ireland and 225 schools, and something between 25,000 and 30,000 children on their rolls. A very large amount of money has been expended in building their schools—the Brothers estimate it at about £154,000. Their schools are conducted in a most admirable manner, and most economically for the country. Indeed the State contributes nothing whatever to the support of their schools. The opinion formed of them by the Assistant-Commissioners of the Endowed Schools Commission was most favourable. Mr Crawford, one of the Assistant Commissioners, says, p. 142, *Endowed Schools Report*—

"The most efficient schools, in my opinion, are those arranged by the community of the Christian Brothers, and I attribute this efficiency to the excellence of their system, the training of teachers, and their zeal in the cause of education."

The training of teachers is a most important thing with the Christian Brothers. I think they keep their young men ten or eleven years before they allow them to become permanently Christian Brothers, and they are all that time under training. Dr. McBlain, another of the Assistant Commissioners, thus refers to their system of training—

"I was much impressed with the general aspect presented by these schools, particularly with their discipline and order, combined with the cheerfulness and docility of the pupils. The boys educated in the Christian Brothers' schools here, in general, attained an unusual degree of proficiency in the different branches of learning in which they are instructed."

"The superiority of these schools is, doubtless, in a great measure to be attributed to the extraordinary personal influence exerted by the teachers over the pupils. In addition to this cause, the Christian Brothers, who teach in these schools, appear to have been remarkably well trained for the business of instruction, not merely that they are themselves good scholars, but that they have acquired a great aptitude in the art of teaching, and an ordinary skill in devising the most efficient method for the organization and discipline of their schools."

The Commissioners themselves observe—

"With respect to the schools under the care of the Christian Brothers, we received no complaints. Our Assistant Commissioners have expressed most favourable opinions as to these schools, in which we entirely concur."

So that there is every reason to be satisfied with the way in which these schools are conducted, and with the proficiency of the pupils who attend them, whilst the country is saved a very great outlay by the labours of these good Brothers. Their schools are conducted upon the religious principle. They inculcate religion continually as their business—it is the general principle of religion—and they have special classes of religious instruction every day. The schools open and close with prayer; everything, in fact, is done to make the children good scholars and good Christians. I must add, what was stated by Mr. O'Reilly in a speech in Parliament, that the Christian Brothers' schools had produced no Fenians, or scarcely one. This is a matter which is very creditable to them, and I believe it is due to the good religious principles which they inculcate. I shall read a circular which was addressed by the present Superior to the Directors of the several houses as soon as the Fenian disturbances were heard of, that is little more than two years ago. The object of this circular was that every possible care might be taken by the teachers

to prevent the spread of Fenianism on any sort of revolutionary spirit amongst the pupils—

"Christian Schools, North Bishop-street,  
"Dublin, December 8th, 1865."

"My dear dear Brethren,—Knowing as you do that it is the teaching of the inspired apostle, St. Paul, that 'every soul be subject to higher powers' that 'There is no power but from God, and those that are, are ordained of God,' that 'Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation,' knowing moreover, that this has also been the teaching of the Church of God from the apostolic times down to our own days, as well during centuries of wide spread and unquenching persecution as in periods of comparative peace, it would seem imperative to address you, whose duty and happy privilege it is 'to instruct every soul justly,' on a subject, which must necessarily be to all of you so familiar."

"But although it should be superfluous, as regards yourselves who have ever faithfully and diligently studied, by word and example, a proper respect for authority, both civil and religious, it may not be so in regard of your youthful charges, especially in the present circumstances of this country. Let us, then, exhort you to continue (and, if possible, with greater zeal and enthusiasm) to improve on their words these religious and salutary maxims—these maxims of practical wisdom and prudence, for their present and future guidance, to which I allude your attention in a former lecture on a kindred subject. Teach them that—while it is our duty to love our country—to pray and struggle for the removal of its wrongs and grievances—we must not, for any temporal advantage whatsoever, violate the laws of God or of His Church, or the laws which the State has justly enacted. And you, my dear Brethren, will bear in mind, that what in a peaceful and settled state of society would not only be perfectly innocuous, but on occasion of grosser wrongs—in law, and public opinion, might, in times of political excitement, be productive of very dangerous consequences. Beware, particularly, when sympathizing with the poor and the afflicted, of saying ought that could be construed as favouring the principles or the designs of the disaffected; and should any Brother (which God forbid) be so far forgetful of his duty as, in his enthusiasm with anyone whatsoever, to adopt or defend revolutionary principles or doctrines, he would not only incur the just indignation and censure of his brethren, but render himself liable to expulsion. My words on this matter cannot be mistaken when I add that hereby absolutely forbid, in virtue of the obedience which he owes to me as his superior, any member of the Institute so to offend."

"To ensure—that the children be taught that the best and truest patriots are those who seek to reform the government of their country by peaceful and lawful means, who endeavour to promote its welfare by attention to their respective duties, by inculcating habits of industry and temperance, by performing works of religion and charity, and by advising those around them by the practice of every virtue. Acting in this way, they will (as an constant dignity of the Church remarks) 'Be true lovers of their country, while those who neglect their religion, or act against its teaching and precepts, tend to destroy the principal national glory of which we have to boast.'"

"Praying our Lord to impart His good Spirit to you all, and give you a 'right understanding in all things,'"

"I am, my very dear Brethren,

"Your affectionate Brother

"This circular is to be read, on receipt thereof, to the whole community, and on the first Sunday of each month till Easter Sunday."

Undoubtedly that letter has had a very good effect upon the teaching in the Christian Brothers' schools, and prevented many young and wild boys from engaging in foolish undertakings.

There is another matter which I just wish to illustrate in regard to the Christian Brothers' schools, that the attendance is much greater in them, than it probably would be in schools in the same place, not conducted by Christian Brothers. There is a very large school close to the Westlandrow Church—it was a National school for several years, but about four years ago it became a Christian Brothers' school. The rolls are kept there still of the school whilst it was under the National Board, and they can be compared with

Feb. 24, 1867  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen

Feb. 14, 1868. the rolls of the Christian Brothers. I give the results in these schools under the two systems.—  
 THE ENDOWED  
 CATHOLIC  
 SCHOOLS.

WESTLAND-BOW NATIONAL SCHOOLS.							
Year	On Roll for the Year	Daily Average	Per cent	Paid by the Board to Teachers	Amount Cost per head		
1875	1,047	296	53	36 s. 3 d.	To the National Board (not to the ordinary Board)	To the ordinary Board (not to the National Board)	
1876	1,150	324	58	29 s. 12 s. 8			
1877	1,062	302	57	29 s. 10 s. 0			
1878	1,071	299	59	17 s. 5 s. 0			
4 years	4,330	305	54	30 s. 7 s. 8			
Average per year	1,082	307	56	30 s. 7 s. 8			

WESTLAND-BOW CHRISTIAN BROTHERS' SCHOOLS.						
Year	On Roll	Daily Average	Per cent	Support	Per head	
1875	617	185	73	30s. 0d.	To the National Board (not to the ordinary Board)	To the ordinary Board (not to the National Board)
1876	617	181	72	27s. 0d.		
1877	645	190	74	29s. 0d.		
3 years	1,879	1,054	74	28s. 0d.		
Average	626	351	74	29s. 0d.		

These schools opened October 17th, 1876.

Since the Christian Brothers got possession of the school there have been in it almost twice as many boys as were accustomed to attend it while it was under the National Board. This shows that the parents and children themselves have a great desire to be educated by the Christian Brothers, and that there is something attractive in their way of teaching. Notwithstanding these merits they are under the ban of the Commissioners of National Education who have adopted the following rule—"No clergyman of any denomination, or—except in case of convent schools—member of any religious order, can be recognised as a teacher in any National school." This rule is directed expressly to exclude the Christian Brothers, though their teaching is cheaper and better than that given by other masters, who are maintained at very great expense. One of the reasons assigned for this rule calculated to exclude the Christian Brothers from future connexion with the National Board was, that they would not submit to be trained. But I find that in Canada, where there is a denominational National system, the law, according to Rev. Mr. Fraser in his Report on Education, page 103, is this—"Every priest, minister, ecclesiastic, or person forming a part of a religious community instituted for educational purposes—and every person of the female sex, being a member of any religious community, shall be in every case exempt from undergoing an examination." That is the law under the local Government in Canada, and which is acted on in Lower Canada, according to Mr. Fraser. I think the best proof of good teaching is that which is obtained by results. When we see that the schools are exceedingly well conducted, and that the children are well taught, we must come to the conclusion that the masters are good.

The rule I have made made to prevent any priest, or any person in holy orders, from occupying a place as teacher in National schools. I do not see why such a law should have been made. Clergymen are often times very well adapted to teach schools, and very capable of acting as Inspectors. In the highest schools and universities in England, and here in Ireland, clergymen take a large share in teaching, in England a considerable number of clergymen are Inspectors, and take a great part in the management of the schools. Why clergymen should be excluded from devoting themselves to the same occupation in Ireland I do not see.

Regarding the schools of nuns, I think they are rendering an immense service to the country. A

great number of them are in connexion with the National Board, but many are not, because they do not wish to submit to many annoying regulations which from time to time have been introduced by the Board. Many of the teachers in these schools are highly educated ladies, many of them would be fit to teach the highest classes in the country; still they devote themselves with great and self-sacrificing to the education of the poor. Their mode of managing schools also is very attractive—they pay the greatest attention to the poor, when they had very rich destitute children, they endeavour to assist them in their wants, clothing them, and providing them education with food. In this way they attract great numbers to their schools, who otherwise would probably have remained without any education. They give the children exceedingly good instructions. These are the National schools better, at all events, if there be any equal to them. In examination before a Parliamentary Committee one of the principal officers of the National Board bore high testimony to the merits of the nuns—I refer to Mr. Cross in his evidence before the Local Committee, 1854, who says—

"I am persuaded that in conventual schools the literary instruction is conducted with even greater advantage and success than in many of the ordinary schools. This is caused by the fact that the convent schools are conducted by a number of ladies of superior attainments, whose end and duty it is, according to their religious order, to attend particularly to the education of the poor, and who take the greatest pains in promoting their literacy, moral, and religious instruction. Their schools are models with regard to discipline, manners, and cleanliness, in fact, the conventual schools present generally the best specimens of education that Ireland can produce."

Notwithstanding these high commendations, it appears by a paper published by the Commissioners, and moved for by Sir Hugh Cairns, on the 16th March, 1864, that the nuns are under several restrictions. The words of this memorandum are—

"That, from the first institution of the National system of education, convent schools, nuns' schools and ordinary schools received equal salary and equal assistance (including even building grants) from the Commissioners, and that this was done with the full knowledge of the public and of Parliament."

"That other kinds of assistance, such as salaries to male teachers and industrial teachers, are given in a larger measure to ordinary first-class schools than to convent schools."

"That the effect of the various charges that have been made from time to time in the salaries to the teachers, is that the ladies who teach in convent schools (originally paid at the same rate as the other teachers), now receive less than one-fourth of the sum paid to the teachers in the highest female schools, in proportion to the number of pupils and only one-third of the average sum paid to the teachers of all classes."

"That the charges made since 1857 have been still more unfavourable to nuns' schools, because, in ordinary schools male teachers receive higher payments than female, and of the same rank, and because the Board will not give any assistance to any nuns' school which had not been opened as a National school before the year 1855."

The last paragraph refers to the Christian Brothers, but it is in the report on nuns' schools, and it will serve to show how the Brothers are treated. As to the personal interests of the nuns, they suffer very little by this treatment, for generally they do not apply the money they receive from the National Board to their own support or to their own convents, but they apply what they get to assist the poor children and to promote education in the country. That is no reason at the same time why the nuns should not get the same salaries as others, especially when the teaching is quite as good, or perhaps better than the teaching in other schools.

The nuns' schools constitute a very important feature in the statistics of the National Board. There are about 140 or more convent schools, with 73,000 children on the rolls, or an average of 515 for each school. The number in attendance is 31,017, or 221 per school. The whole of the subsidy which the nuns now get for themselves amounts to about £13,000.

which at the proportion of 430 for every 100 children, is a *pari passu*. I think if the merits of the same were taken into consideration they ought to be put at least on as good a footing as any other teachers—and certainly they would contribute very much, if their numbers were increased, to spread education through the country, and to make the National Board more popular and more useful to the great mass of the people.

Before I conclude allow me to state that when answering yesterday a question which Lord Dunsany—I am sorry he is not here to-day—was kind enough to put to me—I complained that the members of the Board were not very punctual in their attendance. Since then I have looked over a paper on the subject—I have no full return of the attendances, which I am sure would confirm all I said—but I have a paper connected with the reforms or changes in the Board which was proposed by Mr. Fettes. The changes were of a most important character, and great interest was felt in them through the country. You would expect that a great number of members would have been present at the discussions which took place in the Board with regard to this measure. It appears, however, from this Parliamentary paper that there were eight members present on the 24th June, 1865, the Lord Chancellor, Judge Longfield, Chief Baron Pigot, Lawrence Walker, Esq., John Lantigua, Esq., John O'Hagan, Esq., James W. Mairland, Esq., and the Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, &c. On the 26th June there was another meeting, at which there were six members present. On the 30th of June, a few days after, there were eleven present. On the 17th of July at another meeting on the same subject, there were five present. On the 10th of November, 1865, there were just ten present—on the 30th November, 1865, there were six present—on the 37th November, 1865, there were thirteen present, but at the greater number of the meetings there were not ten present, which is only one-half the whole number of the Commissioners. So their attendance according to this return is certainly not much to be boasted of, and it is to be shamed that the business was most important.

27032. The Chairman.—Does your Honour think it would be possible or desirable at the present moment to revert to Lord Stanley's original plan?—I think the plan was founded on the mixed principle with certain safeguards. Now, the system has failed to such an extent in convincing the people that I think it would be quite useless to return to Lord Stanley's original project. But I think the system as it stands could be refined in such a way, without very much difficulty, as to render it satisfactory to the country. If you allow me I will sketch out what suggests itself to me. The schools should be declared denominational. The difficulties that arise there are to be taken into account. If the population be divided as to religion in a town or district, and if the numbers be sufficient for the purpose, let there be two schools—one school for Catholics, another school for Protestants, and if there be Presbyterians, a third for them. Let the three religious denominations teach their own doctrines and their own systems quite freely in their schools, and let them be dependent upon the National Board only in financial and literary matters. I would not let the Board interfere in anything except in matters connected with finances and letters.

In places where there are several schools, children from the Catholic school sometimes run to the Protestant school, and children from the Protestant school to the Catholic school, and such changes create confusion. To meet this evil I would make the same rule as they have here in the gauge under the authority of the Government. No person confined in a Government prison can change his religion without giving notice to the chaplain, to whose book he belongs, a fortnight before he makes his contemplated change. If a Catholic wishes to become a Protestant, he gives notice to the Catholic priest at least a fortnight before he changes his religion. During that time the Catholic priest has full right to speak and converse with him. If in the end the convert perseveres in

wishing to change, he takes his own course. If it be merely a fit of passion, he has fifteen days to consider what he is going to do. I would have the same regulation in the schools. If Protestants wished to come to Catholic schools I would not receive them all at once, but I would send notice to their minister, and let him communicate with the parents during the fifteen days; and in the end if they persevered in wishing the change, all the responsibility would be on themselves, as acting with a full knowledge of the case. In France, I see by the educational rules that where there are two schools of different religions in the one town, children are never allowed to go from the Protestant to the Catholic school, or vice versa, without a written permission from their parents. My suggestion is that there should be the permission of the parent before a child would be allowed to go from one school to another; and that notice should be given to the minister if the child were a Protestant, or to the parish priest or curate if the child were a Catholic, in order that everything might be done with full deliberation. This plan would prevent many disputes. In places where there are not children enough of one denomination to keep up a school, I would let them go to whatever denominational school was there, but let them be excluded altogether from special religious instruction. I would not change the school on account of the presence of one child or ten children of another denomination but I would keep such children from learning the catechism, or the Bible, or anything that would be considered part of a different religious instruction from their own. Wherever children would be sent to a school of a different religious denomination, I would give the pastor of the children the right of visiting that school. If ten Catholic children attended a Protestant school I would insist that the priest should be allowed to go into that school to see that they were properly trained and that nothing was taught them contrary to their religion.

27033. Would not the priest have that power under the rules of the Board now?—He dare not do it now in non-voted schools. He can go in and walk about, but he cannot do more than that. Just as I can go into Trinity College and walk about and look at it, but nothing more.

27034. Mr. Swettenham.—He cannot be present at religious instruction?—He cannot. The Commissioners can give no liberty to any visitor, whether layman or other person, to interfere with religious instruction, or to be present there.

27035. Rev. Mr. Cooke.—Would not that be the chief object of his visit?—It is the only object. To know whether the children are well trained in reading or spelling has very little to do with the priest's mission. To return to our subject, I would have all the schools denominational, Catholic or Protestant. Then I would not allow a child to go from one school to the other, unless with the full permission of the parent, and with the knowledge of the child's pastor. I would allow the Catholic priest to go into the Protestant school, and the Protestant minister into the Catholic school to look after his children, but to do nothing more. The next thing would be the appointment of masters; I would leave the appointment in local managers and patrons, as it is at present, but I would have the masters better trained, and trained for a longer time; above all they should get a good religious training which they do not get at all now. Besides they should be instructed in history. Moreover, the Catholic clergy should have a right to exclude immoral or irreligious men from acting as teachers in Catholic schools, and the Protestant clergy should have a similar right in Protestant schools. At present the Inspectors assume the right of appointing assistant teachers and monitors in all schools. This is an invasion of the rights of patrons, or of innovation in the system which ought not to be tolerated. The vesting of the right to nominate more than 2,000 monitors, &c., is a step towards giving to the Government the power of appointing all the schoolmasters of the country.

Then we should have denominational training schools.

Feb. 26, 1869.

His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

I would have the Inspectors just as they are in England—Catholic Inspectors for the Catholic schools, and Protestant Inspectors for the Protestant schools; and I would leave the recommendation of the Inspector to the religious body to which the children belong who are to be inspected. And I would add, that if the Inspector disregarded the practice of his own religion, or showed himself a bad Christian, on the representation of the heads of the religious body to which he belonged, he should be dismissed from his office as a matter of course.

I have heard—I do not know whether it is the case or not, but it was mentioned to me—that in the examinations for Inspectors under the Board, matters are sometimes prescribed which may be very injurious to Catholic doctrine. A gentleman well versed in educational matters writes to me as follows:—"I am told that the examination of candidates for Inspectorships is most objectionable for Catholics, being founded chiefly on Mill, and on other authors whose principles are un-Catholic and even un-Christian in their tendency, and that it is of the same stamp to which the Catholic colleges, as you may have seen in *The Month*, have objected so much in the case of the London University." I cannot say that that is a correct statement, but I say it would be very wrong to examine the candidates for Inspectorships in the doctrines of positivism which are taught by many modern philosophers, or in any other system dangerous to religion. If anything of this kind has occurred it ought to be corrected.

As to the books, I would let every religious denomination and every school select its own books. There would be free trade then in printing, and our printers would not be reduced to beggary as they sometimes are from want of business. I would let the Catholics have Catholic books, and the Protestants have Protestant books. Of course treatises on mathematics, algebra, and the mere abstract sciences, would be common to both, and used by all. But I would give free trade in these matters in order to encourage writers and printers. There are many good Catholic printers in Dublin; but I do not think any of them get any chance of publishing the books of the National Board.

I would not allow the Board to give grants of books. The Board gives grants to the schools, and thus gets into its hands the right of selecting books for all schools. And then there is another system which makes the schoolmaster a sort of bookseller. The Commissioners supply him with a lot of books to be sold, and give him some discount on the price for his trouble. I would abolish this system, and if books were wanted by a school, I would give the managers or patrons the means of purchasing them, with the obligation of showing afterwards that the money granted had been properly expended. Books on religion should be approved by the heads of the respective religious bodies. As to the Commissioners themselves, I think the Board should consist of gentlemen of the same rank as are on it at present, but I would see that persons who could attend should be nominated and all others excluded. I would have some Catholic bishops and members of the other religious communities on the Board, so that they could provide for the protection of their respective bodies. In France, according to the law which was passed in 1850, some of the archbishops and bishops were to be always members of the Council of Education and those bishops were to be selected by the body of prelates. In that way they became really representatives of the Catholic body. Hence, if there were two, or three, or four Catholic bishops to be appointed, let them be selected by the body of bishops, and presented to the Government.

27056 At the present time could the Roman Catholic bishops serve on the Board?—Certainly not so long as the present system is maintained. Dr. Murray was on the Board for a great many years. Dr. Denvir of Belfast, was on it for some time; but mixed education was not then so well understood, and the system was looked on as an experiment. Now

everyone understands the dangers of mixed education, and no Catholic bishop would consider himself authorized by conscience to undertake to carry out a system which is in opposition to the Catholic bishops, and the Catholic Church over the world. But were the character of the system changed, were it made denominational, probably no bishop would have any difficulty in serving on the Board, and doing all he could to promote the education of the country. I would let the Commissioners be appointed in the same way as at present, but I would have some *ex-officio* Commissioners, others freely selected, instead of having a Resident Commissioner, I would have two or three paid Secretaries whose duty it would be to prepare the matter for the Board: the Board could exercise full authority over the Secretaries, but they cannot do so over one of their own body.

27057 The *Classrooms*.—Doesn't it often happen both in Ireland and in England, that children of one religion go for a time to a school of another religion, simply for the sake of learning some special subject, the knowledge of which the school of the opposite creed is supposed to teach better, or from some momentary discontent with the teachers of the original school?—To a certain extent I believe that happens—not in very many cases. I think in Ireland children do not change very often where there is question of schools of different religions. And if the schools were declared denominational, and called Protestant schools or Catholic schools, there would be much less changing from one school to another—and with the limitation I put, that they should not change without a fortnight's notice and permission of the parents, and the cognisance of the pastor, I am sure there would be very little changing at all, from one school to another.

27058 Do you think it would be necessary to impose that condition on a change?—I would impose it as every change where a child would be going from a school of one denomination to a school of another denomination, because there is a great deal of bad feeling excited in the country by such changes. Masters or patrons of schools are accused of tampering with the religion of others when these changes occur. It may be that they had nothing to do with the matter, but they are liable to be charged with having promoted such fickleness on the part of the children, or encouraged those changes in order to produce an effect upon the religious opinions of the children.

27059 Did I understand you to say that you considered the rule by which in non-voted schools the patron was allowed to determine whether religious instruction should, or should not be given objectionable to Roman Catholics?—I think it is objectionable, and considered objectionable in every country, religion is looked on as the very basis of education and the most important part of education. You must educate a man for his whole existence. We have a very short transitory existence here. We have an eternal non-ending existence beyond the grave. It would be very unreasonable if we should neglect that which will never have an end, in order to provide for the interests of the very temporary state in which we are placed at present. On that account every Catholic will unite in condemning that principle of the Board.

27060 Are not a very large number of the non-voted schools in Ireland under Roman Catholic clerical managers?—A very great number of them.

27061 Would it be agreeable to them if Protestant clergymen were in the habit of coming into their schools to give religious instruction to any Protestant children attending in them?—It would be only a very exceptional case, if the project which I propose were carried out—if the schools were made denominational. It is only in one case out of a thousand that necessity would arise. It would be looked on in these rare cases as a matter of necessity for the parish minister to go to the Catholic school, or for the Catholic priest to go to the Protestant school, and I think there would not be any dissatisfaction about it.

27062 Practically, does it ever happen now that a Roman Catholic clergyman goes into a school under

Protestant management to give religious instruction?—I know there are some schools where nominally the managers are Protestant, but which are left practically to the management of the parish priests. There is such a school at Portlaoise, under Mr. Evans, a Protestant gentleman; there is another similar school in the parish of Bishleystobes, under a Protestant lady, Mrs. Smith; there is a third school of the same kind in Lank. All these schools are visited by the parish priests, the masters or mistresses are Catholic, and there are but few, if any, Protestant children. There are other schools, but not many, under Protestant management visited by the Catholic clergy, and I think there is at least one of this class on the Duke of Leinster's estates.

27053. Are you aware of any instance in which it is the habit of the Roman Catholic priest to go to give religious instruction in schools where the management is adverse?—There is one school of this kind in this diocese in the town of Blinworth, of which the Marquis of Downshire, or his agent, is patron—the parish priest goes occasionally to that school and visits it. I believe he is allowed to teach the children in it, but when he wishes to prepare the children for confirmation, or to preach to them, he must bring them to the chapel.

27054. Practically, are not these instances very rare?—Very rare. I do not recollect any other instance in this diocese but that.

27055. Is it not of a very rare occurrence also for Protestant clergymen to go and give religious instruction to Protestant children in schools under Roman Catholic management?—I have not heard of any case of this kind in this diocese. It may be there are instances in some places in the north.

27056. In those schools which are under Roman Catholic clerical management, does not this rule give to the priest, as patron, a great privilege and liberty of excluding what he may term erroneous teaching?—It gives him the fullest right to exclude it, but it excludes also positive Catholic dogmatic teaching, and I do not wish to see children deprived of a right which is inherent in them of receiving full religious instruction. I think no children ought to be placed in such a position as to be excluded from enjoying the important right of being fully instructed in their religion.

27057. Do you consider that it would have been desirable to maintain the original intentions of Mr. Stanley, that a register should have been kept of the attendance of children on Divine worship on Sunday?—Well, if the system was to be strict I think it could not be done. If the system had been carried out in a doctrinal sense, it would have been very useful and very proper; but I am quite certain no Protestant master would like to keep a list of the boys that go to mass, and Catholic masters would not be willing to note down those who go to church on Sunday.

27058. Are you aware that as early as the 5th of April, 1852, the National Board represented to Lord Stanley the great objection which was felt to that rule, and that they consequently got leave to rescind it?—I am they actually rescinded it. There is no account in the reports of their having got leave to do it, but they did it *de facto*. Whether they got leave or not is not mentioned in the report. The rule was changed. I cannot say precisely the date, but it was at a very early period of the Board's existence.

27059. In their minute they suggest to Her Majesty's Government the expediency of rescinding it, so that, would it not appear, that they communicated with the Government on the subject?—I suppose they must have done so; but they could have scarcely carried out the rule, even if it had not been rescinded.

27060. Did I understand you to say that you considered that that change was one of those which caused some apprehension amongst the Roman Catholics?—Changes regarding religious matters, and made at so early a date, must have awakened suspicions in the minds of Catholics. Some of these changes were not very objectionable, but they showed that the system had no permanency in it.

27061. Are you aware that the restrictions upon persons in holy orders teaching in common schools is not confined to Ireland, but also exists in England, under the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education?—I know that in England persons in holy orders may be inspectors. I suppose they cannot teach in common schools; but I do not see why they should be prevented from teaching in lower schools, when they are allowed to be professors in the highest colleges.

27062. Are you aware that in England both monks and nuns pass an examination under the Committee of Council, and obtain certificates as teachers?—Yes, I have heard that one, at least, in each house or school must have a certificate. The superior of the nuns, or some one who is looked upon as superior, or the head of the school, must pass an examination, but then assistants may be employed who have not been examined. I heard these things very often, but I cannot be quite accurate about them.

27063. What may be the grounds of the apprehension created by the Board desiring that the schools, towards the building of which they contributed, and which they undertook to repair, should be vested in them as trustees?—The great ground is, I think, a fear that the Government might turn these schools to some purpose of hostility against the religion of the country. You are acquainted with the history of Ireland—you know how much the people have suffered, especially in educational matters, from penal laws. The feeling remains still that schools, or any other appliances in the way of education, might be turned against the people if everything were dependent upon the Government. As long as this feeling prevails the people, they will not consent to have their schools put altogether into the hands of any Government body. I recollect reading a passage from Edmund Burke, in which he says the Catholics might never consent to allow any part of their education to pass into the hands of Government, and if they did consent to that, he says there would be an end of all religion and all morality. I see in other countries where the Government gets possession of the schools, that religious indifference, or hostility to all religion, is continually springing up. That has happened to a very great extent in France, and in the subject now of continual discussion. The higher schools, which are altogether under the management of Government, manifest a most hostile spirit against Catholicity, and against religion in general. On that account, all those who are anxious for the welfare of religion wish to protect education in every country from the influence of Government or a Government monopoly.

27064. In those cases where the Government contributes either the whole or a large part of the expense of building the school, how would you suggest that they should obtain security of tenure and security that the building on which they spent their money shall continue to be devoted to education?—I do not think there would be any great difficulty in giving a security to the Government that the house should continue to be employed for the purpose of education until the Government should get back the full value of its grant. But at the same time I would not allow the Government to establish a system that would oblige those who are trustees or managers of the school to maintain in that school any particular system of education appointed by Government.

27065. Do you consider it undesirable that any class of vested schools should exist? That is, schools directly possessed by the Board, or by trustees?—It seems to me that it would be desirable that the schools should not belong to the Board, but should be private or local property, as Lord Stanley originally suggested and the Commissioners proclaimed in their reports. However, I think a great number of our schools in Ireland are in the hands of trustees; laymen and clergymen unite and hold the schools, but they are not inclined to vest the property of the schools in the National Board, nor to declare that they oblige them-

Feb. 24, 1862.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen

selves to maintain the National system, notwithstanding any changes that may be made in its rules or management.

27076 Can you explain how the changes in the nature of the books, and particularly the increase of the matter relating to moral and religious topics embodied in them, came to be acquiesced in by Archbishop Murray and Mr. Blake, who were Commissioners in those days?—I cannot answer for them. I am sure I do not know how they let such books pass. They must not have examined them very closely. They were both old, and probably they had not time to direct their attention to such matters. In that way the books may have been adopted without incurring their reprobation. But I know that from the beginning, at least from 1834–35, or 1836, there were very loud complaints uttered in Ireland, and a great deal of agitation against the books; and that feeling has been kept up ever since. The Board itself has been obliged, in some instances, to dispense with the use of some of the books. The lessons on Christianity by Dr. Whately and the Scripture lessons which were prepared by Mr. Cullen, are now no longer used in Catholic schools. It required some time to penetrate the meaning and to know the tendency of such books; gradually the feeling became general that they were unfit for the country.

27077 Has the dislike to the system of National education existing now arisen exclusively from its practical working, or has it arisen in part from the greater development and extension of that school of opinion which in England is popularly known as ultramontane?—I do not well know what is meant in England by "ultramontane," but considering the class of people and of opinions designated by that epithet, I believe it may be thus described: Ultramontanism is the teaching of those who are determined to carry out to the fullest extent the principles of their own religion, and who acknowledge in full the authority of the Pope, whom we look on as the successor of St. Peter. Catholics also who are strict observers of the practices of the Church, who fast and go to confession are called ultramontane. Those who do not wish to act up fully to the principles and practices of Catholicity, and to submit entirely to the authority of the Pope, call those who wish to do so Ultramontane, in this sense the term is a reasonable epithet for a Catholic. If I were asked am I an Ultramontane I would say I am in this sense—that I respect the decisions of the Head of the Church, and that I am always an obedient subject in religious matters of the Pope. I think the bishops who consented to give a trial to the National Board were just as ultramontane as the bishops are now. Dr. Murray was a man most attached in every respect to the Holy See, and most devoted to the authority of the Church. I think he was no thorough believer in everything connected with Catholicity as any man could be, but at the same time he thought he might do a great deal of good by patronising the experiment of National education. He always said it was an experiment, he always wrote it was an experiment, and he expected that it would turn out favourable to Catholics. He saw that the Catholics were the great majority of the people; he thought that they would be able to occupy schools for themselves, and by their numbers protect themselves from everything like false teaching. To a great extent his anticipations have been verified, in the greater part of the country the schools are in the hands of the Catholics, under Catholic managers, under Catholic teachers, and conducted in such a way that they cannot do much positive evil. The evil they produce is only negative inasmuch as they deprive Catholic children of a great deal of that religious education to which they are entitled. But the working of a negative evil could not be seen or understood all at once. I think it was just to make an experiment that the Catholic bishops accepted the system from the beginning, and that they were determined, according as the system would develop itself, to deduce themselves for or against it.

27078 Do you consider that the Roman Catholic

authorities have gradually found the working of the system more unsatisfactory?—I have mentioned a great many changes this morning, and I think these changes developed the system in such a way as to open the eyes of all Roman Catholic authorities to its dangers. There are some, to be sure, who still adhere to it, but they are very few in proportion to those who wish a change in the system.

27079 Sir Robert Keene.—May I ask your Eminence to allow me to get some information with regard to the principles of the Belgian system of primary education mentioned on Monday?—I cannot give information in regard to details, but I think that the schools there generally are Catholic and denominational, there are very few Protestants in the country who can create any sort of mixture in the schools. I think there are five millions of Catholics, and only some few thousand Protestants. What they called schools are schools of Catholics frequented by Catholics rather than by Protestants. I am not equal for the details of the system, and I have no book on the matter to refer to at present.

27080 I have here a copy of the Belgian law, and that country your Eminence is aware is free from the objection which the name of the French Government presents. It is a free country, something like our own, in which education and religion are entirely free!—Unfortunately religion is not, I think, very free in it. The Government in Belgium at present is very hostile to the Catholics, so the Catholic clergy, and so the Catholic bishops. A party called *salutaires*, most hostile to every Catholic practice, has great influence in the country. Urban Pruett is at the head of the ministry. He is considered a very great enemy to everything Catholic, and he is doing everything in his power to thwart the proceedings of the Catholic bishops. There were a great many losses connected with the University of Louvain, and he succeeded in getting them taken away, and to what they do not as examples for good Catholics to imitate.

27081 Your Eminence is aware of the law as primary education, which is now in force in Belgium?—What year was that passed in?

27082 It was adopted in 1843, under the ministry of Nothomb, and I believe the Catholic party was in power then, so that it does not refer to the present time!—In Belgium, where everything has to be settled between two parties, and compromises are continually entered into, you cannot expect that the measures adopted would be conformable to Catholic doctrine. In 1842 there was a very strong party on the Catholic side, and stronger than the Radical party. New things set changed. The Radical or revolutionary party is much more powerful than the Catholic; and the laws they make cannot be looked on as specimens of Catholic legislation. But with regard to the education system as conducted in Belgium, I believe it is the case that a great number of the schools have endowments of their own, or parochial endowments, or Catholic endowments, and that where they have not, the communes, just the same as in France, tax themselves to support them.

27083 If your Eminence will allow me I will read the first article of the law—I attach so importance to the Belgian law, but I objected to the fact that the feeling of the bishops is in favour of denominational education. I know they complain very much of the proceedings of the present Government, and also that they look on the schools and universities which are supported by the Government, as doing an immense injury to Catholicity. There was a meeting at Liège, about two years ago, of the students of those universities, and they announced to the world the most awful atheistic and revolutionary principles.

27084 But fortunately, primary education is still regulated in Belgium by the law which was passed by the ministry of Nothomb, so that the condition of that law is most favourable to Catholicity in that country, that could ever subsequently have been!—I suppose it would have been more difficult since 1842 to obtain anything good, but I say that at that time the Catho-

He did not obtain what they ought to have obtained, and I would not be guided at all by what the deputies and minority say, or what they do in Belgium. The present kingdom was created by a revolution, and it is governed by a revolutionary, anti-Catholic party at present, and that is not a proper state of things from which we can deduce arguments in favour of the Catholicity of their measures.

27485. Then your Eminence would not be willing to accept the law on primary education in Belgium as any possible guide to what ought to be a favourable arrangement for the Roman Catholics in Ireland?—I must confess that I do not know it well. I know that the bishops there are decidedly in favour of denominational education. I know that they complain very much of that sort of a mixed system, which the Government has introduced. As far as that goes, I agree perfectly with those bishops. As to the details of the management of the system of primary education, I do not know them, and if I knew them (very probably) I would not be guided by them.

27486. I take the liberty of reading one or two provisions of that law, thinking that it might in some degree harmonize with the views of the Roman Catholic authorities in this country?—I gave my views on education as distinctly as I could. I do not know whether they harmonize or not with the views of the Belgian deputies, but I am quite determined not to attach any importance to their assessments.

27487. Mr. Gibson.—I understand your Eminence to be most decidedly opposed to all mixed education?—Most decidedly, it is to be tolerated only in cases where you cannot avoid it. I was in a mixed school myself when I was a little boy, because there was no other school in the country where I lived.

27488. Then we may refer to your Eminence as a man of mixed education?—That would not be quite fair, because I was only a little boy, and scarcely able to learn anything when in a mixed school. Any real education that I received was given to me in Catholic schools.

27489. Then it would not be at all dangerous to tell or teach?—I am afraid if I had remained in the school where I was, I would not have learned much about faith or the practices of Catholicity.

27490. You referred to a letter written by Bishop Doyle, in 1828?—1827. I think it was. I have the letter. I think it is published in Dublin in 1827.

27491. That was before Lord Stanley's letter?—Long before it.

27492. Will you allow me to refer you to a letter which Dr. Doyle published after Lord Stanley's letter?—I suppose that is the letter which is contained in the reports?

27493. It is mentioned in the reports?—I have read it, but I think it was written before the system was in operation.

27494. Of course it was, but it refers to the general principle. (Rush.)—

"Carlow, Dec. 20, 1831."

"REV. DEAN SMY.—You have been made acquainted through the advertisements in the public newspapers, with the scheme of the plan or terms on which the funds placed by Parliament at the disposal of the Lord Lieutenant, to promote the education of the children of the Irish people will be dispensed."

"These terms had been long sought for by repeated applications to Government, and by petitions to Parliament, and have at length, with much difficulty, been obtained. They are not, perhaps, the very best which could be devised, but they are well suited to the special circumstances of this distressed country. They provide for the religious instruction of children by their respective parents, or persons appointed for that purpose by them, as often as these persons can deem it necessary. This instruction shall be given on one or two days in the week, and may be given, as I hope it will, every day."

"The school-house, to be built at the public expense, is to be secured to the public. This is all the Commissioners require, and this is just—any, it is necessary, in order to guard against individual capriciousness."

"The Commissioners claim to have control over the schools to be used in schools. This appears to be an assumption from which evil as well as good might follow. It is

good that schools or numerous books be controlled, and by authority excluded. This proposition is also in no regard—but it may not be so elsewhere—and 'law,' says the Apostle, 'is placed not for the just man, but for the unjust.' It gives no trouble to the man who acts properly. It gives pain and brings punishment only to him who exists or transgresses his duty."

"This assumption would produce evil if the Commissioners sought to corrupt the education of the Irish people. I defy them to do so, even if they were so minded, but they are not. Their purpose is straight. Their views are to promote education, religion as well as theory, and to preserve full and entire freedom of conscience. Should they not succeed to the present Commissioners, and attempt to corrupt the education of youth, we are not dumb dogs who have not how to bark. We can guard our flock, and do so easily by the simple process of excluding the Commissioners and their books and agents from our schools. We might by doing so foster the ill which they would, if the arguments were isolated, be entitled to wishful, but in withholding it they would be answerable to Parliament, to which we also would have access."

"The lesson on Christian charity, which the Commissioners wish to have inculcated, is one due to our hearts. I hope they will have it printed as a heading to all their spelling and reading lessons, and placed as a frontispiece to all their books."

"The rule which requires that all teachers, hereafter to be employed, be provided from some model school, with a certificate of their competency, will aid us in a work of great difficulty—to wit, that of suppressing hedge schools, and placing youth under the direction of competent teachers, and of those only."

"The power claimed by the Commissioners to fine, suspend, or remove teachers, is somewhat exorbitant; but the exercise of it might in certain cases, where religious differences or religious parties arose, be salutary. If this power were exercised to the detriment of any well-conducted school, which is scarcely possible, we have the same remedy against its exercise that we could resort to in the case of the introduction of newspaper books. This claim, therefore, is not one to which we are called upon to object."

"During the many years in which education has been in this country a source of religious dissension, our school-houses have been built and generally attached to one place of worship; whilst the school-house built by Parliamentary aid have been sited in detached places."

"Some years past it would have been easy to combine education, and have only one school-house in place of two, not so at present, and thus only one effort that season which has hitherto been presented at great expense, and at great expense. I neither think that you may be enabled in your explanation or reply to the Commissioners, to point out the true and very sufficient reasons why, in those districts, so well supplied with school-houses, few requests for aid to assist schools can as yet be made in that poor manner, by Catholic and Protestant dissension, which the Commissioners so justly reprobate."

"Having presented this much, I now beg you will, without unnecessary delay, apply to the Commissioners before mentioned for aid, whether to build or to furnish, or to support, or the case may warrant, each of your parochial schools."

May I ask you whether or not, at this time, in 1831, the plan proposed by Lord Stanley was not suited to the special circumstances of Ireland?—The plan proposed by Lord Stanley is not that which is now in operation, and the latter just read does refer to our present system. If you will just observe the last words of the second paragraph of Dr. Doyle's letter, you will find "religious instruction shall be given" [that is, according to the bishop's views, Catholic instruction shall be given] "on one or two days in the week, and probably not, as I hope it will, every day." One of the rules now is, that any manager may prevent any sort of religious instruction every day in the week. Another rule is that any Protestant or any Presbyterian manager, may exclude a Catholic priest altogether from the schools. So Dr. Doyle speaks of a system which does not really exist at present. He is speaking of an imaginary system which has not been carried into operation.

27495. Is there anything to prevent a Roman Catholic priest having instruction in his school every day for as many hours as he pleases to appoint, either before or at the end of the school hours, or one entire day in the week, under the system now?—Do you speak of schools occupied by Catholics?

Feb. 24, 1832.  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb. 20, 1868.

Mr. Endicott  
Catholic  
Catholics

27095. I speak of a Roman Catholic patron, a Roman Catholic manager.—He can have religious instruction ever day in the week, and twice in the day, I believe, if he wishes. But there are other schools of a far different character.

27097. And so far as that is concerned, does your Eminence think that the system is one which should be described as one of a purely secular kind?—As we are speaking of his letter, I must say the system described by Dr. Doyle is one which has no content at present.

27098. I am speaking of the system as it is in existence now.—It had no existence when Dr. Doyle was writing. First, it was not introduced at all at that time, and secondly, the system introduced since is not the same as that mentioned by Dr. Doyle. The power to exclude all Catholic teaching which I have mentioned shows it is not. Then, though there may be good schools under the National Board, when you are asked to form a judgment of the whole system, you must look to every school in it, and see whether or not there are any bad schools, or whether any part of the system allows the establishment of bad schools. There is a maxim in theology because of original sin; *malum ex genere* or *ex genere* defectus. It is one of the maxims we have in our moral theology.

27099. Admitting it is so far changed.—I beg your pardon. There is another matter in Dr. Doyle's letter, paragraph the 3rd.—"The school-house to be built of the public expense is to be secured to the public." Well, that was not the case under the system proposed by the Board, as they wished that a good part of the expense of building the schools should be paid by the local managers or by the congregations, and that then the whole property in the school should be vested in the Commissioners. Dr. Doyle would not have approved of this. In another letter—I think in the letter a portion of which I have read, he states that the schools would belong to the parishes.

27100. It is not in this letter here?—It is not in this letter. I read the letter yesterday, in which the statement is made. So little inclined was he to mixed education that he says that he would retire to the mountains and to the bees, and teach his children himself if any attempt was made to interfere with their religious principles. Hence he was most opposed to the Education Society's schools, and he wrote so many letters and treatises against that system, that his friends did not fear to state that he shortened his days by that bad work—writing against mixed education.

27101. You referred to the introduction of religious matter into the school books as one of those changes which your Eminence is disposed to deprecate, if I understood your consumption?—Certainly; I think that religious instruction, when given in common to Catholics and children of other creeds by a Protestant teacher, may be made an engine for assailing Catholic doctrines; and I think I have proved that pretty well by evidence from Parliamentary reports, and from the evidence given before the Parliamentary Commission.

27102. With great respect I wish to refer to this point. You allege as one of those changes which were injurious the introduction of religious matter into the school books?—Even if it commenced from the very beginning I would object to religious instruction being given to Catholics by any one not a Catholic.

27103. I wish, in order to place the matter before your Eminence and before others, that your Eminence would refer to this statement, which you will find in page 4 of the Report of the Educational Inquiry before the Select Committee in 1854.—

"Before the Board was established, at a meeting of the proposed Commissioners, both in the Castle of Dublin, a question was put by one of them, whether, if the Commissioners were agreed, any amount of religious instruction introduced into the secular or common instruction would be permitted by Government. A good deal of friendly discussion followed, which was summed up and closed by Lord Stanley saying that whatever the Commissioners were unanimous upon the Government would not object to. This

discussion considerably altered the original proposed system, and rendered it, instead of being a rigid system of exclusion of all religion from the definitions of the Board and the common education of the people, an experiment how far Roman Catholics and Protestants could proceed together with perfect security in introducing Scriptural light among the population generally—an experiment, considering what the state of Ireland had been for centuries, perhaps the most interesting and important, but, at the same time, the most delicate and difficult that was ever invented in any constitution."

It turned out to be a very fruitless experiment in the end, I think. After it was well tried the project has been exploded.

27104. But it would appear from this, whatever the opinion of your Eminence may be, that the introduction of some religious teaching was not thought of?—In the beginning Lord Stanley proposed united secular and separate religious education. That proposal was not carried out. Even if it had been brought into operation I would not approve it. There cannot be true education without religion. It is opposed to Godless education, and also to any system that does not give the fullness of Catholic teaching to Catholic children.

27105. This was before the Board was established?—Well, according to Lord Stanley's letter the Commissioners were to "edit and print such books of moral and literary education as may be approved of for the use of the schools;" but they were not to edit religious books or books containing religious matter at all. You see how even that letter states that the system was an experiment. Now the experiment has been well tried and has failed. If it had not failed we should not be sitting here to-day.

27106. Your Eminence condemns the books generally as being such as if carried out to the Atlantic might be compared to the depths without any serious injury being done?—It is my opinion that if the whole of them were put into a vessel and cast out into the sea, neither literature nor religion would suffer any loss.

27107. You also expressed your opinion that the books had been composed in a way that never had been heard of before?—Well, I think so.

27108. In a most extraordinary manner?—I read Mr. Curdle's account of the way in which he compiled some of the principal books, and I think it was most extraordinary. He being a Protestant minister undertook to prepare Scriptural books for Catholic children, and he got the Protestant tutors in his own school to make their suggestions on the proofs he submitted to them. I never heard of anything so strange.

27109. Allow me to read the account of Mr. Curdle, as to how he compiled some of the other papers?—

"Having no books of our own to compare with, we examined and sanctioned several series of school books—some after a certain amount of expurgation."—

Well, who authorized them to expurgate those books?—

27110. Allow me to finish.  
"Among others, a series was submitted to us by a Roman Catholic institution, under the patronage of the prelate of the diocese. These books, to the credit of Roman Catholics be it said, contained a larger portion of religious instruction than any school-books I had met with, and after the sanction of a single page, and of some isolated expressions, these books received the sanction of the Board. I immediately availed myself of these books as an indication of the amount and nature of religious instruction which Roman Catholics wished to have introduced with secular instruction; and in superintending the compiling of books for the Board, I kept these Roman Catholic books in view, introducing into the Board's books a large amount of religious instruction, but interwoven with a much larger amount of secular instruction than the Roman Catholic books contained."

That was the account of Mr. Curdle of the original composition of some of these books?—I read for the Commission a different account given by Mr. Curdle himself of the way in which he compiled the books for the Board. (See question 27049, p. 1227.) I do not think Mr. Curdle is quite correct in his statement, because, I am quite sure, if you take those books compiled by



him and run over them, you will find that there is no modern information in them taken from Roman Catholic authors. As to the religious instruction contained in Mr. Outh's compilation, the language and matter show that it is not taken from Roman Catholic works. The first books of Scripture extracts have nothing Catholic in them, and I have pointed out a great many things in other books which certainly I never saw in Roman Catholic writers.

27111. Your Honour is acquainted, of course, with the constitution of the Poor School Committee in England, and in charge of the Roman Catholic poor schools of that country?—We have here a gentleman connected with it; I am sure he will be able to put us right on anything in reference to the schools.

27112. Are you aware that the books of the National Board, up to 1851 at least, and I do not know how long after that time, were received by the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee, as books on the whole of a beneficial character to their schools?—Perhaps they did not take the trouble of examining them.

27113. I should apologise to my friend Mr. Stokes, but as these books have been so strongly condemned by your Excellence—of course the highest authority connected with the Catholic Church in Ireland—at it is important that I should show that others at all events have not pronounced the same censure?—I do not say that others may have defended them, but I say that if you examine the books, you will find it very hard to defend them.

27114. (Rocks).—

"Brook Green House, Harcourt-street,

"1st August, 1851."

"Sir,—The attention of the Poor School Committee has been called to a pamphlet issued from Her Majesty's Stationary Office in Dublin, respecting the publications of school-books by Government at the public expense.

"The complaints made on this subject relate exclusively to the books of the Irish Commissioners, and reports are current that the circulation of the books in question will no longer be encouraged by the Committee of Council on Education."

"It becomes, therefore, the imperative duty of the Poor School Committee to represent, that although applications are submitted to be made from at least two quarters for the insertion upon their (the Poor School Committee's) list of books issued by Catholic authors, and constantly used in schools, yet as such books have been added to the condemned list, with the sanction of the Irish publications, comprises no value available for the elementary instruction of Roman Catholic children. If then the Irish books are struck off the list, Roman Catholic schools will be deprived of all benefit under their landlords' look grants, and will so far be again excluded from participation in the parliamentary grant for education."

"And, short of this result, if the agitation which has been raised should succeed in wresting from Government the power to furnish schools in Great Britain with books at the present moderate prices, and in procuring for any private publisher licence to add to these prices a large percentage for their own profit, the progress of education in primary schools throughout the Kingdom, and more particularly in Roman Catholic schools and in workhouse schools containing Roman Catholic children, will be seriously impeded by the increased difficulty which the managers will experience in buying the necessary supplies of suitable books."

"As recommending a large and poor and ill-instructed class of Her Majesty's Irish subjects, and as co-operating actively with the members of the Committee of Council, the Poor School Committee cannot refrain from entreating their lordships to refuse assent to any proposals that would either exclude from their schools, or raise in price the Irish Commissioners' school books which, apart from the remuneration of their agents, as stated above, the only books in the list available for Roman Catholic schools, they regard, after much examination and experimental use, both as being *per se* the best elementary series in the language, and also as most suitable for education in any possible scheme of National education."

"I have, Sir,

"Signed, ROBERT NAUMANN STOKES.

"The Secretary, Committee

"of Council on Education."

This is signed by Mr. Stokes in 1851, giving of course his opinion and the opinion of the Catholic Poor

School Committee upon these books?—I think that it is an appeal of misericórdia to the Government not to deprive them of the advantage of getting the Irish National school books very cheap; they state that the congregations are poor, that they can get no other books at so low a price. They say there is no other regular series of books published as yet and adopted for National schools.

27115. It says more than that; it says they regard these books, after much examination and experimental use, both as being *per se* the best elementary series in the language, and also as most suitable for education in any possible scheme of National education?—I do not undertake to defend all the statements that the Catholic Poor School Committee may have made; but there is one thing in their case which ought not to be omitted. They were asking for books for schools of a denominational character, in which religious works are used, and religion is made the basis of all education, and in which masters and inspectors are Catholics, and the whole atmosphere of the school Catholic. If there was little about religion in our National school books, or anything wrong in them, the general teaching would meet the evil. In our schools the case is quite different, as religion is banished from them, and so religious works are allowed. I will add that the Catholic Poor School Committee seems to act cautiously enough. They say that they are very desirous to be allowed to use the Irish National school books, because they are cheap and their people are poor; and because if these books be taken from them they would have to recur to worse books. Perhaps in 1851 no cheap series of Catholic books had been published, and the books published for Protestant schools could scarcely be adopted by the Catholic Committee. I am sorry I have not here some of the series of books published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. They are filled with attacks on Catholicity. The Irish National books have plenty of errors in them. They open the way to the introduction of false teaching, and a great deal of Catholic doctrine which ought to be taught is omitted. At the same time they are better than many other books, which teach positive errors, and attack Catholics openly. I think it must have been on that ground that the Catholic Poor School Committee was so anxious about these books. But I do not look on myself as obliged to agree with that document or to defend it, but the gentleman who has signed it undoubtedly will be able to tell what his own opinions and views were upon the case.

27116. I do not wish, of course, to enter into any argument or discussion with your Excellence. I should be afraid to do so?—Not at all; I am only stating my opinion. I cannot speak for the English committee.

27117. I will just put this question to your Excellence, and I do it with all respect. Suppose that the suggestion of your Excellence, that these books should be sent out to the Atlantic, had been made?—

Well, that is my opinion; I don't expect any one else to adopt it.

27118. The Poor School Committee would express themselves more strongly, they would say, "don't destroy those books"?—The Poor School Committee would have agreed with me, if they thought that by doing so they could get a good Catholic series of books. My opinion is that our National school books prevented us from having good Catholic books, and contributed to keep our children in ignorance of many things they ought to know, putting them at the same time in the way of learning error and false doctrine.

27119. Your Excellence has referred to the state of education in the different continental states. I understood you to refer to Austria, and to have stated that since the revolution in that country there might have been some change?—I do not know what change they have made since the revolution; you know it is a very modern thing; but I know that as far back as 1851 the Protestants got denominational schools and colleges for themselves under the patronage of the Government, or at the expense of the Government.

Vol. 24, 2866

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb. 24, 1868.

His Grace  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

27120. The Commission has written, and got the latest information from Austria, and I hold a translation, which I think will be found to be correct, and I will just refer to one or two of the sections—I do not know particulars about their present position, I know they are all in a very excited state in Austria, I know there is a great deal of revolutionary spirit there at present, and I should not be surprised if they would do very extraordinary things.

27121. This is signed by the Emperor, and counter-signed by the Minister of Public Instruction.—I know that the laws regarding the church, marriage, and other important religious matters, have been changed.

27122. (Reads).—

“Law of the 25th May, 1868, whereby the fundamental conditions of the relations of the school to the church are established.”

“In force for all kingdoms and lands represented in the Reichsrath.”

“With approval of the houses of the Reichsrath I hereby establish the following law:—

“1. The supreme direction and supervision over the whole department of instruction and education, belongs to the State, and will be exercised by the authorities who will be legally appointed thereto.

“2. Giving this right to supervision, the care, conduct, and immediate supervision of religious instruction and religious exercises for the pupils of different religious confessions will be left to the several religious communities.

“The instruction in all subjects other than religion in all such schools is independent of the influence of any Church or religious community.

“3. The schools and educational institutions wholly or in part founded or sustained by the state, by a province, or by a commune, are available to all citizens of the state, without any regard to difference of religious belief.

“4. Every Church and religious community is free to establish and maintain from its own funds schools for the instruction of the youth of their own particular creed.

“Such schools are however, subject to the laws on education, and can claim recognition as places of public instruction only when all legal conditions for requiring those rights have been complied with.

“5. The staffs of schools and places of instruction for the members of particular creeds, is not refused to the members of other creeds by anything in this law.

“6. The officers of teachers in any of the schools or places of instruction designated in section 3, are accountable equally to all citizens of this state who have proved their capability in the manner laid down by the law.”

Though that law contains much that is wrong, I see there is a certain sort of recognition of the rights of Catholic bishops and priests in that law. I suppose that is a very late law?

27123. It is of the 25th of May, 1868.—Since that time the Austrian deputies have made a law against the religious ceremonies of marriage—not least compelling the people from contracting marriage in a religious way; and they have made several other laws quite in a spirit of hostility to religion; but I do not think the people of England or the people of Ireland are prepared as yet to banish religion altogether from the country.

27124. I hope not.—I hope we shall never see the day when that will take place; but I am afraid there is a party in Austria that would do so; but I would not be guided, at all events, by their desires, and would not care if they were even sanctioned by the Emperor; he has no responsibility according to the constitutional form introduced at present, it is the minister, and it is a Protestant minister that signs that decree.—I suppose Mr. Russ Bonst.

27125. We have a maxim in our own country that the queen and the king can do no wrong!—And it is now the same in Austria.

27126. You have referred to the Belkist Academic Institute and the report upon that; that place was one of the first schools in Ireland in which the mixed system was introduced; and you have referred, I think, to the evidence of Dr. Cooke.—I have not my papers with me now, but I have copied accurately from the Government commission what Dr. Cooke said, and I think he spoke as strongly as anyone could, and as well, about the dangers of mixed education. I was quite pleased with his observations.

27127. Is your Eminence aware that some very distinguished members of the Irish bench received their education at the Belkist Academic Institute?—I have no doubt of all that some very distinguished men received their education there; but I should like to know where they got their religion.

27128. I might perhaps be able to answer that;—it would not have been there—it would not have been at the Belkist Institute, I suppose.

27129. Would you be surprised to hear that Lord Chancellor O'Hagan was educated at the Belkist Institute?—Well, I was educated at a Quaker's school, so Daniel was safe on the head desk; there is no end of names.

27130. And his predecessor, Lord Chancellor Napier, was also educated there. One of them, I believe, a conscientious Roman Catholic, and the other an equally conscientious member of the Established Church.—Some of the very best men have been educated, in case of necessity, in Protestant schools. St. Gregory and St. Basil were educated in a pagan school with Julian the apostate. Occasionally one person will pass safe through danger, but if the multitude be exposed to the same risk, the loss will be great. You cannot draw an argument from individuals where there is a question of a whole country. Individuals may escape from the greatest dangers, but masses of people exposed to the same risks would sustain great loss. Suppose there was a law made now:—

27131. We can only argue from what we know, and when we find that men of high entrance in general attainments pass through these without receiving any harm, is it not fair to conclude that they are not so very dangerous?—It is fair to conclude that some individuals have passed safe through mixed colleges, it is possible for an individual to do so.

27132. But seeing that Lord Chancellors O'Hagan and Napier, and Judges Hayes and O'Brien, two on each side—two Roman Catholics and two Protestants—have been educated there.—If there were 300 I would not alter my opinion. I would not be guided by individual cases at all where there is a question of a nation. Then we should ask if two have escaped the danger, how many have perished in it? *Quasi periculum*, says the Scripture, is *periculum*.

27133. Your Eminence has referred to the school history by Mr. Gleig, may I ask does your Eminence know what books on history are used in the schools of the Christian Brothers, in the Roman Catholic schools of Ireland?—Well, I have seen the Christian Brothers' history taken from Froebel, and I think it is very good, but it is written for Catholics and not for Protestants.

27134. Do you know the history by Trevelyan Young, &c., written for the use of Catholic youth?—Probably I have seen it. I do not know who the author is, and I think he must have written under a pseudonym. I never saw the book in any of our schools.

27135. May I ask your Eminence what you understand by Roman Catholic children being induced to frequent Protestant schools or Protestant children being induced to frequent Catholic schools by “unlawful means”—what do you designate unlawful means?—Suppose a man was proprietor of a factory in Belkist, a merchant, or manufacturer, and that he were to tell the Roman Catholic people, who were employed in his factory, “If you do not send your children to my school, which is a proselyting school, I will dismiss you from my service.” Suppose a landlord having a similar school were to say to a poor tenant, “Unless you send your children to my school, I will remove you from my estate, or give you no employment,” in both cases the persons concerned would employ *unlawful* means to promote proselytism.

27136. But does your Eminence mean the word “unlawful” only in a moral sense?—In a moral sense, I am not speaking about statute law. The persons referred to would be perhaps justified in law, but not in conscience or in justice.

27137. Do I understand your Eminence to say that no teacher, being a Roman Catholic, should be appointed without the licence of the Ordinary of the diocese to

which he belongs—I did not say anything like that. I do not think I ever gave a licence to any teacher, nor have I ever required any teacher to apply to me for a licence.

27138. Do you think that there should be a veto by the Ordinary of the diocese upon the appointment of a Roman Catholic teacher?—What I meant to say is, if the teacher were a man who held doctrines contrary to those of the Catholic Church I would exclude him from the right of teaching in a Catholic school; if the teacher were a man who gave scandal, if he were a drunkard, or if he were corrupt in his morals I would equally exclude him from teaching in any Catholic school, a veto of this kind should be granted to the clergy.

27139. I am speaking of a Roman Catholic teacher in a Roman Catholic school?—I am speaking also of a Roman Catholic teacher in a Roman Catholic school. I say if a Roman Catholic teacher were appointed to a Roman Catholic school, and if I discovered that he was a drunkard, or that he was a corrupt, immoral man, that he was a blasphemer, or that he had committed any public offence which would be a source of scandal to the people, I would put a veto upon him, or I would close the school sooner than let him teach children.

27140. That was not what I meant exactly; but would you say this—would the fact of his being a Roman Catholic, not subject, so far as your Eminence knows, to any ecclesiastical censure, be sufficient to warrant you in allowing the children of your diocese to attend the school where such a teacher is?—A man may be free from ecclesiastical censure and not fit to be a teacher. Hence the manager of the school must inquire into the character of the teacher, and examine the recommendations he brings. Experience will supply the rest. If the manager finds the teacher a good, proper man, he will retain him, and if he finds him a bad man he will turn him out, but as to giving them a licence, I do not think we have any such thing at all. I know I never heard of a licence given to any teacher in Dublin. Formerly the authorities of the Protestant Church used to give licences to Catholics to teach, but that is given up.

27141. Your Eminence does not approve of that being necessary?—I am quite convinced licences are not necessary, but care must be used to secure good and moral teachers.

27142. Does your Eminence object to teachers trained elsewhere than in the schools of the Commissioners being obliged to submit to examinations by judges appointed by the Commissioners, professors, and others, in order to test their competency for teaching, and that they may obtain certificates accordingly?—I would judge of them by the results of their teaching. If the persons referred to proved by results that they were good teachers I would let them go on. If the results were not good I would suspend the public grant to such schools, and let them either get fit teachers employed on their own resources.

27143. Do you think there is any necessity for a certificate of competency for a teacher?—I think the country would be better off without so many certificates. I would not require certificates.

27144. So easy?—I only ask for one!—But I suppose you would introduce a general system of certificates for every class of teachers.

27145. The question was, whether or not, in the case of a teacher trained elsewhere than in the school of the Commissioners, your Eminence would object to his being obliged to submit to an examination by competent parties, in order that his competency might be tested?—There is no religious objection against such examination, but I say it is better for the general purposes of education that there should not be introduced into this country any system of certificates.

27146. I confine my observation altogether to secular matters—and it is not at all in a religious point of view—viz. that the Commissioners as a body have nothing to do with—My objections are not as a religious point of view either. Religion does not decide whether teachers should be examined, but I think, as a general

rule, it is better for the country that teachers should be tried, and then judged by their results.

27147. Supposing that the project which I understand your Eminence very much advocates were adopted—namely, that the teachers should be trained in model schools, or other large schools not under the Commissioners, do you think that they should, before going to teach generally, receive from the Board in Dublin, from a Board of examiners of some kind or other, as trained teachers, or testifies of competency?—I do not think there is anything bad in that in itself, and the training schools could give certificates of proficiency which would have great weight.

27148. As to secular teaching?—I would let the certificate be a private matter, not a State affair. I think the Government could secure the appointment of good teachers without having recourse to that system. There is a great deal of trouble in examining, and giving certificates, and appointing examiners, and everything of that kind. Such a system cannot be carried out without great expense, and increasing Government officials without necessity. When managers wish to employ a person for a school, let them see his testimonials and inquire about his qualifications afterwards. When the teacher has been a while in the school let the results be looked to, and an Inspector will be able to tell whether he is a competent teacher or not. There is another observation, if you allow me to make it, and it is true. Those who pass the best examinations and get diplomas must really are often the very worst teachers; they have their thoughts fixed on situations in which they could get on in the world; they look on a poor school as a bar to their advancement, and having a high idea of their own acquirements they think it very income to teach the very first rudiments, the first principles of education to poor children.

27149. Your Eminence does not certainly disapprove high secular attainments from the power of teaching?—Certainly not, but where poor children are to be taught the lowest elements of letters, all the teachers ought not to be required to have high secular attainments, and if they be required to have them, they may not unite with them the power of teaching.

27150. Is there not a great variety of grades from the lowest class of untrained teachers upwards, from the second of third up to the first of first?—What I meant was that I think that some of the first class of first may not be the best teachers. If a man be sufficiently instructed, though he may not attain to every high branch of learning, he may be an excellent teacher. There is another thing which it has not occurred to me to mention before. I think the requirements for the teaching in these National schools ought not to be too great. I would teach the children to read and to write, and to cipher as far as the table of three and practice, and I would give them a practical and well-founded knowledge of the doctrines and duties of religion, and some little account of the history of the scriptures, and the Church; I would not compel them to enter into discussions on grammar or the Greek texts, or metaphysics and metaphysics, and other classes of animals, and similar questions that are not necessary for the poor people. Too high an education will make the poor children disoriented, and will unfit them for following the plough or for using the spade, or for hammering iron, or for building walls. The poor ought to be educated with a view to the place they hold in society, in which it will be impossible for them to cultivate the higher branches of literature and science.

27151. Your Eminence does not go so far as to say that the Irish peasant should not be taught in such a way as to afford him an impetus as it were for putting himself forward and rising up to a higher grade of society, and that he should be taught merely as a lover of wood and dower of water?—There are several millions of poor people in Ireland and out of these there will not be 500 that will ever rise to any distinction in literature, and I would not reduce education until

Feb. 24, 1853.  
His Honour  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

for the majority in order to give a very small minority a chance of getting on. If there were a thousand children in a school, and five or six displayed great talent, would it not be unjust to introduce a system sanctioned to the wants of the 995 in order to cultivate the talent of a reasonable minority?

27142. Is it a necessary consequence that if you afford facility to one man, you must keep another down, so that the other be neglected?—I would not keep anyone down at all. I would give a good education in the rudiments to all. But, if any were likely to excel, I would not change the character of the schools for their interest. Let them try to get into higher schools. And I do not think it would be necessary to make the poor schools of such a character as to prepare the pupils to be lawyers or doctors, or poets, or historians. If they be prepared to be ploughmen and spade-men, and smiths and sawyers, I think that will be the proper preparation for the bulk of the people.

27153. But "poets another, sea fit" your Eminence recollects, we cannot educate poets!—According to Horace, poets must be well trained and well instructed, just like other classes, but I am afraid that there will not be many poets in our poor schools.

27154. I understand your Eminence objects to the mixture and the style of education given in the model schools?—I object to have the children of the rich supported by the State in model schools.

27155. Allow me to read a passage taken from a report of Mr. Kaye Shuttleworth:—

"In Bavaria I found the same proofs of the excellence of the primary schools. I remember particularly a visit to one school in Munich, which may be fairly taken as an example of all, for all the schools in that State are remarkably good. When I entered I did not know anything about the children, or to what ranks of society they belonged. The appearance of all was so clean, respectable, and orderly, that I imagined they were all children of tradespeople. I therefore asked the teacher to tell me what their parents were. He answered: 'the two boys you see here are the sons of country yeomen; the child of a tradesman, there is the son of a peasant, there a son of one of the Court servants;' and so he continued to point out others who were the children of professional men, shoemakers, tailors, &c. I then said: 'Have you any here whose parents are so poor as not to be able to pay anything for their education, and who are consequently dependent on the town charity for their instruction?'—'Oh, yes,' he immediately answered, 'the one you see yonder,' pointing to a very clean and respectable looking child, 'is one, and there is another,' and so he continued to single out several others, who were paid for and clothed at the expense of the State. The very fact of the children of such different classes of society being mingled together in the same school will serve to prove to any unprejudiced mind the excellence of the schools themselves, as well as the civilization of the poorer classes; for if the schools were not good enough for the rich and noble, so if the poor children were as rude and uncivilized as the children who frequent our ragged schools in England, we may rest assured that the richer parents would not allow their children to attend the same classes with them. The same association of children of different ranks of society takes place to even a greater degree in Switzerland."

Now, does your Eminence believe that the confining of schools exclusively to the poor, without any intermingling of better grades, is a desirable thing in a country where there ought to be common feeling of citizenship and a common feeling of love permeating through all classes and leading one to another in a harmonious consent?—My opinion is that a school like that which you describe would be good another for the rich as well as for the poor. I am persuaded that there always has been and always will be to the end of the world, a great distinction between rich and poor, and I think that the rich ought to get one sort of education and the poor ought to get another sort. Each class ought to be educated for the sphere of life in which they have to move. If I had the care of the son of a nobleman I should be very sorry to put him into the school described by Mr. Shuttleworth. If I had the care of a number of poor children, having taught them to read and write and cipher, and especially their catechism, I would send them out to the country to learn to spin and to dig, or to become apprentices to a carpenter or

a smith, or a tailor or shoemaker, and to prepare them for their after life, but I would not put them into that school to learn to live like gentlemen, and to pretend to things to which they never could attain.

27156. You referred to an unfair position of sons in convent schools—that they are paid less than what they are fairly entitled to. Is your lordship aware that the ladies in convent schools themselves are not paid, but that the money is paid to the superiors of the community, and that the rules of the Board is exceptional with respect to those schools, inasmuch as in all other schools they require the persons to be trained, with a certificate of classification, to receive an allowance?—I do not think there is any exception in favour of the same. The superiors of the convent acts as manager, and it is in the right of the manager in every case to receive the payment from the Board.

27157. It is only the manager's hand through which the money passes to the teachers; the parties who actually teach in convent schools receive no money, if I am informed rightly—your Eminence will know better than I do?—In every case in regard to sums it is to the manager that the money goes, not to the teachers, and then the manager hands it to the teachers. Well, in this case the teachers and the superiors all constitute one community—one society—and they agree to manage that money in a certain way. They give the money to the poor children or employ it in some way to promote public education, and I think in that way there ought to be no exception made against them or to their detriment.

27158. All schools at first were put under the obligation of allowance?—And the convent schools then got as much as others, and things remained so until 1839.

27159. They remained in the same way, but other schools agreed to have the teachers trained. The ladies of the convents would not submit to training, and, therefore, do not receive now the salary which in other schools an ordinary teacher would?—In regard to other teachers, training is not required.

27160. Classified?—Other teachers are classified. But I think if the same teach well, nothing ought to be done to put them in a position worse than that of other teachers. The results of their teaching are acknowledged to be excellent. They render great service to the country. It would be a financial or an economical advantage to the country if there were more men and more converts in it, and I think no restrictions ought to be put on them or the Christian Brothers, but rather that every encouragement ought to be given to them.

27161. Your Eminence referred to the rules that were made from time to time by the National Board with respect to the attendance at religious instruction. Will you allow me to read to you the last rule made on the subject, and to ask your Eminence whether you consider that it affords a sufficient protection against any proselytizing effort?—

"No pupil who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Protestant is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction in any school giving such instruction is a Roman Catholic, and no pupil who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Roman Catholic is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction in any school giving such instruction is not a Roman Catholic. And further, no pupil is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of any religious instruction to which its parents or guardians object. Provided, however, that in case any parent or guardian shall express his desire that he should receive any particular religious instruction, and shall record such desire in a book to be provided in the school when necessary for that purpose, such prohibition shall not apply to the time during which such religious instruction only is given. The entry in the book shall be signed with the name or mark of the parent or guardian, and the book shall be submitted to the Inspector as often as he visits the school. Such expression of desire may at any time be revoked by the parent or guardian, and shall thereupon become inoperative."

The effect of that being that no child, without the express written direction of the parent, can attend to any religious instruction given by a man of an oppo-

gic religion. Does that satisfy you?—No; it does not satisfy me.

27162. May I ask what alteration you would suggest?—Make the school denominational, the simplest answer at all. If you make the schools denominational, we will not be splitting hairs any longer.

27163. Then, I understand that no possible arrangement of the mixed system will remove the apprehension that your Eminence entertains on the subject?—Nothing else than the establishment of a denominational system will remove my apprehensions. I am for the introduction of a denominational system for all classes, most decidedly.

27164. Rev. Mr. Corie.—You have allowed that in some cases there might be schools which you would be obliged to tolerate, in which the children would be mixed in faith, in such a case as that, would not that regulation be sufficient? If the premises were left out, and it were absolutely forbidden that a teacher should give religious instruction to any child not of his own faith?—Whilst the mixture continues it is hard to prevent the religion of children to be interfered with if the master were of a different religion. The proviso referred to was introduced for this purpose, but did not succeed. The teacher might get the parents to sign the permission to assist at his religious instruction without knowing what they were doing.

27165. But my proposition went to abolishing that proviso, and instead of it to forbid the teacher absolutely to give religious instruction to any child not of his own faith?—If there be any case where a mixed school is necessary, such a prohibition ought not to be enacted. If you provide that the master shall not teach anything but known religion to the children of his own creed in the school, and that if there be children of any other religious persuasion, they shall leave the school when he gives religious instructions, there would be some original against direct proselytism; that is, I think, what was intended in the beginning of this system, but was never properly carried out. I must add that, even supposing that this prohibition were introduced, teachers could still, by example, insinuation, or otherwise, ignore the faith of children differing from them in religion, and I would not approve it as a sufficient protection for Catholics.

27166. Mr. Gibson.—Would you go on so far as to say that a parent should not be allowed to withdraw a teacher to give religious instruction to his child?—It depends upon the perception of the parent. If the parent believes that one religion is as good as another, probably he would not trouble himself at all about what religion his children were being taught. If the parent were a Roman Catholic, and believed there was only one true faith, he would violate his conscience if he allowed his children to learn the principles of any other religion or of any other persuasion. Were a person to say that everyone can teach what religion he likes, that one religion is as good as another, that it is a matter of indifference what religion we profess.—

27167. I am speaking of a parent?—I am speaking of a parent, too. Suppose a parent who had no religion in particular, who was "unsatished," as they say, who believed that one religion was no good as another, such a parent, acting according to his own false principles, would say that his child might be educated in any religion. But, suppose the parent were a Roman Catholic, and held that there is one true Church, that that Church is infallible, and that every Catholic is obliged to adhere to its teachings, I would say that such a parent, permitting his children to be trained in another religion, would commit a very grievous offence against faith, and against his conscience; that is the principle I wished to express.

27168. Mr. Deane.—Just on that point I wish to ask your Eminence one question. Would not that demand for full liberty to the parent, for which Mr. Gibson is contending, be fully met, in case Mr. Corie's plan were adopted, by allowing the Catholic parent who wished his child to receive Protestant religious instruction, to register him at once as a Protes-

tant?—If he do so he sacrifices his conscience. The parent, if he be really a Catholic, believes there is only one true faith, and by registering his child a Protestant he consents that his child shall profess a religion which he believes to be false. The principles of Catholics compel them to act in one particular way. Those who think that one religion is as good as another, and that every one has a right to select a religion for himself, cannot take much interest in the religion of their children; they ought indeed to let the children choose for themselves, but Catholics cannot consistently with their religious principles act in this way.

27169. Judge Morris.—Your Eminence I believe objects in *deane* to a secular education which is not combined with religious instruction?—I think education, to be worthy of the name, ought to provide for the whole existence of man; it ought to give him a good secular instruction, to prepare him for his duties in this world, and good religious instruction to provide for the interests of eternity. That is my humble opinion upon the matter.

27170. And that would be applicable to all classes of Christians at all events?—I quoted here yesterday the opinions of Milten and Locke, and several English statesmen; of Guizot, a French Protestant writer; of Pottolli, who was minister of instruction under Bonaparte, Bismarck, who was minister in Prussia. These writers and statesmen, though of different religions and of different countries and politics, all agree in admitting that without religious education would rather be a scourge to a country than anything else.

27171. And that being applicable to all classes, of Christians at least, as it not peculiarly applicable to those who profess the Catholic religion, in which there is so much of dogmatic teaching?—Certainly, I made that observation also. I stated that the Catholic Church teaches several great mysteries; for example, the Trinity, the Incarnation and death of our Lord, the real presence in the blessed Eucharist, and many other things, which are very difficult in themselves, and which, unless deeply impressed upon the minds of children, will not be remembered or professed in after days. Besides there are a great many practices not easily observed—fasting, hearing Mass, going to confession, observing other laws of the church, all these things appear hard to flesh and blood, and, unless children be accustomed to them from earliest years they will never attend to them afterwards.

27172. That necessarily therefore which is so peculiarly applicable in the case of Catholics generally, is it not also more peculiarly necessary in the children of the poor who have so little opportunities of any teaching?—Certainly, and that is the reason I am so strong in favour of denominational education, because then the teaching in the schools would be permeated with religion, and the children who could not be instructed at home, would be fully instructed in school, and would grow up in the belief and practice of their faith.

27173. That being apparently so rational a view of it, to what do you attribute the great opposition which undeniably exists on the part of a considerable portion of the prominent persons in this country?—I am not aware that any great opposition to the making of education religious exists in this country, a great number of the bishops of the Established Church are quite in favour of education being based upon religion. I think all the Catholic bishops and priests and people are imbued with the same notion.

27174. But are you not aware that there is a very considerable body of the laity who look upon this denominational system being adopted, to say the least of it, with some distrust?—Well, I am not aware that such a feeling exists among the laity—I know a great number of the Catholic laity and think I scarcely ever met anyone who declared himself for mixed education. I never met a Catholic gentleman that did not send his sons to Catholic schools, and his daughters to convents or other Catholic schools. I never met a Protestant gentleman who did not send his sons and

RA. 24, 1868.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Corie.

Feb. 24, 1863.  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

daughters to Protestant schools, and I see that even at the last election our candidates for parliamentary honours generally declared themselves in their addresses in favour of denominational education.

27175. I did not ask your Eminence whether there were many of the laity who were in favour of a mixed system of education, but I asked you whether you were aware of a considerable portion of the laity who look with some distrust, in the present circumstances of the country, on the proposition of making the education of the country altogether denominational, and therefore do fancy allowing it to fall into the hands of the ecclesiastics?—I am not aware that there is any great portion of the laity hostile to religious education, though there may be some fear; and I am not aware either that from the fact of education becoming denominational it should necessarily fall into the hands of the clergy. If a good Catholic layman erected a school and managed the children properly, treating them in religion or getting others to treat them, and preserving their morals, I would encourage him just as much as if he were a Catholic priest. We have several instances of that kind.

27176. Of course, as a matter of fact, persons must be employed in the work of education who are not ecclesiastics; but, pray, in the scheme which you have sketched out, except so far as the Board of Commissioners, who are to interfere to the extent only of paying the money, have not the ecclesiastical body the entire control?—Oh, not at all, the manager of the school has the whole control. The manager and patron of our schools are essentially laymen. If they conducted them properly, and let religion be taught, and the morals of the children be provided for, no one would interfere with them.

27177. But who is to be the judge if they conduct them properly?—Those to whom the care of matters relating to eternal salvation has been given—the bishops appointed by God Almighty to govern his flock. “Go, teach ye all nations,” said our Lord to the Apostles, and in them to their successors, “teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.” In virtue of this commission the bishops have a right to teach religious doctrines, and to prevent the dissemination of religious errors. They have two rights, the one negative and the other positive. This is admitted by all Catholics.

27178. I am not asking your Eminence about the right, and the fact which you have quoted would rather tend to give an affirmative answer to the question which I put. But would it not be the fact, independent of the right that, except so far as the Board were to be instituted for the purpose of paying the public money, the bishops under that Divine mission which you have referred to, would have the entire control?—No.

27179. Would not the fact be so—would not they be the judges if the teachers taught properly? Would they not be the judges according to your plan, if the Inspectors were proper persons to be kept; and did you not require that the Inspectors should be appointed on their presentation, and dismissed on their representation? Did you not further require that the books should be the books that the bishops approved of and selected, and then, if the teachers existed solely at the will of the bishops, if the Inspectors were called into existence on the motion of the bishops, and ceased their existence as Inspectors whenever the bishops so willed, and if the books were to be the books that they selected, would your Eminence now please to state what portion of education would be out of the entire absolute control of the ecclesiastical body?—Let us begin with the books and go backward. Now, I did not say that the books for secular instruction should be approved of by the bishops, except so far as that they should contain no doctrinal errors, or anything contrary to faith or morals. There are thousands of books upon mathematics and physics,

and upon a variety of other subjects, books of poetry, books of literature, which if they contained nothing contrary to faith or morals, the bishops would have nothing in the world to say to them, as they are not connected with religion. They act as a judge does with those who come before him. A judge does not interfere with honest people, but when violations of the law are brought before him he enters into their cases. The same may be said in regard to books. A layman compiles books, and brings them into operation in a school, and if they are free from error and immorality the bishop has nothing to do with them, and says nothing about them. But if there be errors in them he may condemn them and get them excluded from the school—that leaves the full right of censoring books and introducing them into schools to laymen, provided they do not violate the law of God.

27180. But does it not leave the right of rejecting them, and of the approval of them, from whencever come—for arguments sake I am sure that the right would be properly exercised—but does it not leave the final rejection or approval of the books with the bishops—as you illustrate it, to the sentence of the judge—does it or does it not leave the irrevocable and final judgment of the books with the bishops?—I will just illustrate the subject by an example.

27181. Would your Eminence let me have an answer first—of course we should all listen with the greatest pleasure to any illustration of it, but an illustration is seldom a good answer to a question. It cannot well be answered without a little illustration, and I am sure you will allow me to illustrate it. I think we are both looking for what is right and just, and if we can get at the truth by a few words more, there ought to be no complaint about the waste of words or time. Suppose a man having committed a theft goes to confession, the priest will counsel him by his power to give back the stolen property—to make restitution; and at the same time he does not exercise any temporal control over the property of the penitent. The priest does not invade his rights, but merely requires him to obey the law of God. In the same way, when erroneous or immoral books are introduced into a school, the Church, or the bishops of the Church, or those who act for them, condemn such books, not interfering at all with books free from every stain.

27182. I must again, with great respect, return to the question which I asked your Eminence. If the bishops are to be the arbiters, finally and irrevocably, to decide if a book is an improper book, or if it is a proper book, have they not got the supreme and entire and absolute control?—You might as well say that the bishops have the control of every opinion that a Catholic holds, because if he holds anything heretical, he comes under the jurisdiction of the Church and is condemned, the truth, however, is that the Church allows him to think as much as ever he likes, and say what he likes, provided he does not hold anything heretical or immoral.

27183. You must see, your Eminence, that I am not getting into these other questions that might lead to discussion—but I am asking you, as a matter of fact—yes or no, with great respect—do you not seek on the part of the bishops to have the final approval or disapproval of the books to be used, yes or no?—I cannot explain the matter more distinctly. Bishops merely exercise the authority given to them by God when they want that books containing heresy or immorality shall not be used in schools, or to books free from heresy or immorality, the bishop does not interfere with them. There have been hundreds and thousands of copies of Houghton's and Ellinger's mathematics, and other such books circulated in our Catholic schools, and the bishops never interfere with them—they are used in Catholic schools as freely as in any other schools.

27184. The noble chairman asked your Eminence whether you considered that the objection to the National system arose from any increase in ultra-monastic opinion in Ireland. Now, I will ask you the converse of that question, whether you do not think

that a considerable portion of the distrust of the Catholic hierarchy allowing the education of the country to fall altogether into the absolute control of the hierarchy in Ireland does not arise from the modern to a certain extent denationalising of the Irish hierarchy?—I do not understand the last part of your question.

27185 Does not the distrust, assuming it to exist, spring up the absolute control of education in Ireland, to a certain degree, exist from the spread, or from the supposed spread, of ultramontane views amongst the hierarchy within the last fifteen or sixteen years?—Well, first I do not agree with you in admitting that the distrust exists to any extent—to any extent worth taking into consideration.

27186 But, to the extent to which it does exist, reprehensible as that may be in your opinion, do you believe that it has arisen at all from the increase of ultramontane views, as it is commonly called, amongst the Roman Catholic hierarchy within the last fifteen or sixteen years?—I think it would be quite unreasonable to expect that four or five millions of people should agree in such a manner as that there should be as difference of opinion amongst them; therefore I am quite prepared to say that there must be some difference of opinion amongst Catholics on various subjects where faith is not in question. Besides, I do not consider that those reports about ultramontanism have any foundation, or that the people are frightened by them. All Irish Catholics, as a body, are devotedly attached to the Catholic Church, and they are most devoted to the Pope. I think there were more efforts made by our people in favour of the Pope, within the last few years, than were made in any other country in Europe; hence being devoted to the Holy See and to the Catholic Church, in which ultramontanism consists, the Catholics of Ireland are to be looked on as belonging to the ultramontanes, and I think they would rather have their children under ultramontanes, than under people who think very little about their own religion at the head of their Church.

27187 Who was the bishop who neither signed the letter to Mr. Cardwell nor the letter to Sir George Grey?—If you allow me to see the signatures, I will be able to tell you in a moment [Paper handed to His Excellency]. There is only one I think, about, that is Dr. Mac Hale.

27188 You mentioned, I think, in answer to the noble chairman's question, that you did not quite well understand what was meant by the spread or the increase of ultramontane opinion?—I do not well know what some persons mean by ultramontane opinion. I use it as a most offensive word in the English press; when scolding a man they sometimes say he is a rogue and a thief, and they wind up by adding, even so ultramontane. What they mean by that I do not say to understand.

27189 You know, of course, that the meaning of the word itself, *ultra*—beyond—the meaning, was applied to the holders of extreme Italian views?—I knew in Italy they call the Gallians ultramontanes. In France I suppose they call the Italians ultramontanes. What the meaning of it is in the English press, except it be taken as an opprobrious word, I do not know.

27190 Do you not know that it is meant not in any opprobrious sense at all, but that it is applied to those amongst the governing body in the Catholic Church, who have not as much tendency towards nationality in the Church of the locality as others?—I think the people of Ireland have no tendency to a National Church at all. They could have had a National Church three hundred years ago, if they only changed their religion; but sooner than have a National Church they submitted to the direct persecution in order to adhere to Rome, and remain in communion with and subject to the Holy See.

27191 I did not say a National Church, if your Excellency would attend; I said nationality in the Church—I would be obliged by your explaining what you mean by nationality in the Church? I cannot answer otherwise.

27192 I will. Was there not a considerable discussion about the change in the mode of the election of the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, which was introduced in your Excellency's appointment?—In reply, permit me to say that the question refers to matters which have nothing in the world to do with the business of the Commission, however, I will explain the state of things. Formerly the bishops of Ireland were generally appointed directly by the Holy See. My two predecessors, Dr. Troy and Dr. Murray, were appointed in that way. The archbishops of Armagh were appointed in the same way from the days of Dr. Flanagan down to the time of Dr. O'Reilly. About the year 1830 the Pope made some gracious concessions to the Irish Catholic parochial clergy in reference to the appointment of their bishops. The Brevet of the Holy See, granting these favours by which the clergy of the different dioceses got permission to choose their candidates, declares that the Holy See may select one of the three, or exclude all three if it wish, and select somebody else. The Brevet was fully observed in my appointment. In Armagh I was appointed by the Pope, exercising the right reserved to himself in the Brevet. In Dublin I was again appointed by the Pope, after having been chosen by the clergy and presented by them to His Holiness. In neither case was there anything in opposition to the ancient custom of appointing bishops in Ireland, as to the privilege granted by the Pope to the Catholic clergy in the Brevet of 1830. However, all this has nothing to do with the business of the Royal Commission.

27193 Your Excellency cited a passage from Burke from memory. I have it—a letter which I will read for your Excellency—"That great statesman, Edmund Burke, admonishes us in the strongest terms against agreeing to such a course. 'If you consent,' says he, 'to put any part of your education under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money.'" &c. That, I presume, is the passage to which you referred?—Yes, that is one of them; there is another passage of similar import.

27194 That is the passage, at all events, which was referred to in the report of the meeting of the clergy at Dublin, held at Marlborough-street, on the 18th of December, 1857, and it is the same passage to which your Excellency referred today. Are you aware that that was a letter addressed by Edmund Burke to the Princess at the time, Archbishop Hurley?—He was not Primate; he was Bishop of Waterford, or Rector of the College of Maynooth.

27195 Were not the words "your education" there, and the subject matter of that letter the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and not the education with which we are dealing now at all?—Certainly, but Burke extended the question and referred to education in general. "Any part of your education," he says.

27196 Would your Excellency allow me to read the words again which you quoted as applicable to the education question which we are dealing with. The letter of Edmund Burke to the bishop was on the subject of the education of the Roman Catholic clergy, and are not those the words—"That great statesman admonishes us in the strongest terms against agreeing to this course. 'If you consent,' says he, 'to put any part of your education'—Is not "your education" there?—Is that the whole sentence?

27197 "Under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end not only to the Catholic religion, but to all religion, all morality, all law, all order in this unhappy kingdom." Are not the words "your education" there applicable to the education of the Roman Catholic clergy, and if they are so, how can the words "any part" of that apply to anything else? If the mayor is applicable to the Roman Catholic clergy, how can any portion of it be applicable to anything else? I think the words taken from Burke distinctly refer to every sort of education; for he was quite opposed to making education a State-engine—that was a principle of Burke's—and he treats of it in other

Feb. 24, 1858.

His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb. 24, 1853  
 His Eminence  
 Cardinal  
 Cullen.

plans, and shows that he did not wish the Government to take up the education of the country.  
 27198. In it that the words "any part," that you have already referred to, that you say mean education generally—the words are "any part of your education," "you" being applicable to priesthood—I read the sentence very carefully, and I think it applies to every portion of education, the words of Burke are: "If you put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money." When Burke refers to clerical education, and then adds any other portion of your education, he undoubtedly speaks of every sort of Catholic education, and he condemns those who would allow Government to interfere at all in a matter so closely connected with religion. I am sure of the greatest writers at present hold the very same opinion. I read very lately some extracts from "Mill's Philosophy," and he has a whole chapter to prove that Government ought not to be allowed to interfere with the education of a people. In this country, as the persons who form the Government profess different religious opinions, they would not be able to inculcate any particular religion into the people's minds. See Q. 27198.

27199. Your Eminence, when Archbishop of Armagh, in the year 1850, which, I believe, was very shortly after your Eminence was appointed Archbishop—?—Yes, I was appointed in 1850.

27200. You stated in that year a pastoral to the clergyman of Armagh in which I find the passage which I am about to read. May I ask your Eminence first was that issued before the Synod of Thurles?—No, it was after.

27201. [Reads].—

"The duty of teaching faith and morals.—These subjects must have a direct or indirect connection with the various departments of human knowledge, and the exercise of the divine commission must consequently extend to the supervision and control of every system of education proposed or instituted for children of the Catholic church, but in any particular department of knowledge they should be infused with errors or opinions at variance with their faith."

Do you still in any sentence which you suggest the education, adhere in its entirety to that passage?—Most fully, and it is very obvious that I copied out and have kept the whole passage before and after what you quote. I intended to ask his lordship to get it inserted after a passage from the Synod of Thurles, to which I referred. I think, however, that the passage from my letter is not fully given in that extract which you have read.

27202. I took only portion of it—I will read the whole passage for you. Here is what I have said and it is in substance what I have repeated over and over during this day.

27203. If you please?—[Reads].—

"The right which we enjoy, and the obligation under which we are placed, of attending to the education of youth are derived from the divine commission, by which we exercise our spiritual authority. This commission, which was given to the Apostles and their successors, in the following words: 'Hear ye therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world' (Matt. xxviii, 19, 20), evidently includes the duty of teaching all the dogmas of faith, as well as all the principles of morality—whether as regards the natural, civil, and moral government of the State, as well as whatever concerns the conscience of man in his individual capacity, or in his social relations. All this is directly contained in the divine commission; but the subjects thus indicated must have a direct or indirect connection with the various departments of human knowledge, and the exercise of the divine commission must consequently extend to the supervision and control of every system of education proposed or instituted for the children of the Catholic church, but in any particular department of knowledge they should be infused with errors or opinions at variance with their faith; so that the divine commission given to the Apostles implies a positive duty, imposed coarsely on them, to teach all divine truth; and if I may say so, a negative duty or right to oppose the teaching and

to resist the propagation of every error opposed to heavenly revelation."

That is the explanation I gave at that time. I adhere to it still, and I think it is a very fair explanation.

"This right of inspection and control wherever there is a question of the faithful connected to our charge belongs pre-eminently, as you are all well aware, to the Episcopal body, according to the words of the Apostle, 'take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.' (Acts x.) When the education of the children of our diocese is in question, the matter is within the jurisdiction of the ordinary of that diocese, when many dioceses and provinces are concerned, then the question is not to be decided by any particular bishop, but by all the prelates of those provinces, or when they disagree by the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff. To assign such a right, to shrink from the duty it involves, to suffer the little ones of Jesus Christ to be torn from the maternal bosom of the church, and delivered up to the hands of unprincipled or irresponsible teachers, or to be infused with erroneous doctrines, would be to prove false to the divine commission we have received, to abandon to the world, like the traitor pastor—the flock committed to our trust and to dishonour the glorious ministry with which we are invested by a treachery as cruel as it would be unprincipled."

"This right of instructing the faithful in the truths of revelation, and of raising every system by which error may be propagated and infused into the tender mind, has been always vindicated to itself by the Catholic Church, and sometimes strenuously than in our own days. The venerable bishops of Germany assembled at Würzburg (the place where the relics of our holy ancestor, St. Kilian, are preserved) in the autumn of the year 1848, loudly proclaimed it. 'The Church' say they in their pastoral address 'will persevere in preference to everything else, her sacred right to educate and teach; she will never allow the child to be torn from her mother's breast; she who is the fount of education for the people.'"

27204. But the passage which contains the pith of it and which I have extracted verbatim, so far as the matter that this Commission is dealing with, is that in which you say that the divine commission extends to the supervision and control of every system of education?—It is explained repeatedly afterwards in the part which follows.

27205. Then is the explanation.—"Last in any particular department of knowledge they should be infused with errors or opinions at variance with their faith." Therefore, does not the divine commission as you lay it down there very plainly extend to the control of every possible department and atom of human knowledge?—Control, so far as to be able to teach divine doctrine and prevent the spread of error. There are the two points to which the control of the Church extends.

27206. That may be the necessity for the control?—That is the control given by our Divine Lord according to the words of the Scripture, and which Catholics all admit. If the power of teaching the doctrines of the gospel, and the right of raising the spread of error be denied to the bishops, who are to hold the place of the Apostles until the end of time, the commission given to the Apostles would be nugatory, and Christ would not be with his Church until the consummation of ages.

27207. Are not your words that the divine commission extends to the supervision and control of every system of education?—So far as what—

27208. Pardon me, your Eminence, not "so far," because "so far" would be words in limitation, but it extends generally to "the supervision and control of every system of education," and then you give your reason why—not as a limitation, but as the reason why it should "last in any particular department of knowledge they should be infused with errors or opinions at variance with their faith."—Well, if there be no departure from the truth or no teaching of error there will be no reason then for interfering, and the bishops will not be called upon to exercise their authority and control.

27209. But are not the bishops to be the judges themselves as to whether it be necessary to exercise



that control?—The bishops have got power in this from Christ, and their power cannot be contested.

27210. Your Eminence, do not imagine that I am going into the question of whether it is right or wrong. I am only making you a question in order that we may arrive at a close, definite conclusion of what is sought, not as to whether it is a right thing or a wrong thing. But does not your statement as to that pastoral go to this extent: that you and the bishops and the clergy, to whom it is addressed, demand the supervision and control of every system of education, —let me not say far, but “lost” in any particular department those who receive the education might go astray? —Well, in so far as that, we require control so as to be able to teach revealed religion. We require control so as to be able to prevent the spread of error. We ask nothing more. This is the intemperance I put upon my own words. I am sorry I have not the whole letter, because there is another passage in it taken from the Archbishop of Cologne, in which he explains the matter more fully than I do, and that is, that there are two points on which we have a right to interfere—first, to teach doctrine, and secondly, to prevent error.

27211. You observe that in that pastoral you did not make the limitation which you did to-day in the books that were to be selected in the tendency to be

denominational, except in the abstract sciences. You made no limitation in your pastoral about the abstract sciences?—There was no necessity, because in the abstract sciences unless you wilfully introduce some extraordinary thing that has no connexion with the subject, there will be no need of interference. However, things indifferent in themselves may be turned into instruments for propagating error. I gave an instance yesterday, that of a man teaching writing who would propose something erroneous or immoral as a text for the children to copy. With him I would interfere and say, “You have no right to teach the children such things as that.” If a man teaching chemistry or geology were to assert that the cosmogony of Moses was in opposition to the order of things at present existing, or contrary to science, I would remove him from his teaching. Geology has nothing directly to do with revealed doctrine, yet, when turned to bad purposes, the Church would have a right to condemn such teaching. This is what I meant when I said the exercise of the divine commission must extend to the supervision and control of every system of education instituted for the children of the Catholic Church, lest in any particular department of knowledge they should be infected with errors or opinions at variance with their faith.

[Adjourned.]

Feb. 24, 1869

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

# SEVENTY-SECOND DAY.—DUBLIN, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1869.

## PRESENT:

The Right Hon. the Earl of PARR, *Chairman*.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. the Lord  
Bishop of MENCH.  
The Right Hon. Lord CLOSBROCK.  
The Right Hon. Mr. JUSTICE MORRIS.  
Sir ROBERT KILG, *B.A.*  
WILLIAM BRIDGE, *Esq.*, *M.C.*  
Rev. DAVID WILSON, *D.D.*

Rev. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, *Ed.*  
JAMES ARTHUR DEANE, *Esq.*  
JAMES GIBSON, *Esq.*, *Q.C.*  
SCOTT NAINMYTH STOKES, *Esq.*  
WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, *Esq.*, *PH.D.*  
LAURENCE WALSHAM, *Esq.*

GEORGE A. C. MAY, *Esq.*, *Q.C.*, } *Secretaries*  
D. B. DENNE, *Esq.*, }

## His Eminence Cardinal CULLEN further examined.

Feb. 25, 1869

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

27212 The Lord Bishop of Menck.—Your Eminence has emphatically reiterated that the only system of primary education which can satisfy the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities in Ireland is the denominational one?—I am altogether convinced that it is the only system that will establish peace and concord amongst all denominations, and satisfy the Catholic and the Catholic population.

27213. The chief ground on which you claim this extensive control over the education of the country is the inherent and inalienable right of the bishops to be the sole and supreme judges of all things pertaining to faith and morals—a right and a privilege conferred upon them by our Blessed Lord's commission to His Apostles?—The right of the Catholic bishops is undoubtedly great; it is derived from the commission given by our Lord to the Apostles to teach all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19), for the bishops are the successors of the Apostles, and inherit all their ordinary rights and privileges, and especially the right of feeding their flocks with sound doctrine, and preserving them from false doctrine.

27214. This is the chief ground on which you claim the right of control over the education of the country?—A control to the extent which I explained.

27215. Over faith and morals?—The bishops have a right to teach everything connected with Divine truth, and to prevent the spread of error which would damage that teaching. This right is derived directly from the commission of our Lord, and it has been always maintained by the Catholic Church.

27216. This right of the bishops to control and direct

education is not limited, of course, to any class or grade of society?—It is not limited to any class of those who are subject to the authority of the Catholic Church. The bishops can teach the truth and prevent the spread of error—each bishop in his own diocese, the bishops of the world and the Pope acting together, or the Pope alone, all over the world.

27217. I mean, it is not restricted to any particular grade or class of society—it extends to all?—It extends to all Catholics in each diocese—to the nobility and gentry and the poorer classes.

27218. Now, is not this right often not exercised by your Church in relation to the higher classes of the laity of your communion in this and other countries?—In some countries the exercise of this right may be occasionally prevented by unjust laws or violence, but the right always remains.

27219. Being a matter of such grave necessity, what is the reason it is not exercised as well in the case of the higher as in the lower classes of society?—The right exists in regard to every class, and is continually exercised in regard to all Catholics, but there may be individual cases, in which some will not submit, just as in the case in reference to other laws and rights. In every country there is a law not to do violence to your neighbour; still a great many will violate that precept, and commit murder. There is a law not to steal, but still people will steal. There is a law in the Gospel to obey the prelates of the Church, and a great many will not do so. Free will is too often ready to transgress every law.

27220. Mr. Searcy says, in that journal which

Feb. 26, 1869.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

has been referred to frequently—1—Mr. Nieuwenhuis?

27221. Yes; he says that "under any training, Catholicism must be unfavourable to mental development. A man who has been accustomed to abstain from exercising his reason on the most important subjects to which it can be applied, can scarcely feel an earnest anxiety for the truth—a determination to get to the bottom of every question he considers, which is the principal stimulus to improvement in all the branches of knowledge. This does not apply to higher laymen in France or Italy, for they do not believe in the premarriage of Catholicity, but it must always influence the minds of the English and Irish Catholics." Is it any apprehension of this kind, on the part of the laity of this country, that prevents the general application of your principle to them?—I do not well understand the force of the question. Mr. Senor—

27222. Is it from any apprehension on the part of the Roman Catholic laity in this country and in England of the tendency of Roman Catholic training being unfavourable to mental development, that they decline to submit themselves entirely to the control of the Church in matters of education?—I think Mr. Senor is totally mistaken in regard to what he says about the tendency of Catholicity to prevent mental training and mental development. The greatest philosophers, the greatest theologians, the greatest historians, the greatest poets, the greatest architects, the greatest painters and sculptors, and the greatest statesmen—many of the greatest men who have ever appeared in the world, in any of the departments of life, belonged to the Catholic Church. Take Bossuet and Fenelon, St. Thomas and Suarez, Descartes, Pascal, Copernicus: you will find very few equal to them; and yet their talents were developed under the guidance of the Catholic Church. There is nothing in her teaching to prevent the development of genius. The Catholic Church teaches that we are to believe everything God has taught: all the doctrines communicated to the Church by our Divine Lord, and preserved in the written or unwritten word of God. What God reveals must be true. What is truth cannot prevent the development of truth, or the acquisition of the knowledge of truth and mental development. The development of the faculties of man is not promoted by wild imaginations, or extravagant opinions, but by the pursuit and cultivation of truth; and as truth never can be in opposition with truth, so the truths revealed by heaven never can be in opposition with natural truth, or philosophical truth, or any other sort of truth. Hence the infallible teaching of the Church is a protection against error, not an impediment in the way of real progress.

There is an insinuation at the end of the passage from Mr. Senor, that French and Italian Catholics do not believe the truths of the Catholic Church. This charge has no general application. There are individuals such as Mr. Senor describes, but they cease to be Catholics, as soon as they wilfully deny one doctrine of the holy Catholic Church; otherwise you should say Voltaire was a Catholic, or Diderot. Voltaire was originally a Catholic, and, I believe, like many infidels of the present day, he never called himself anything else, but he was not a Catholic after he had denied the faith, for it is essential, in order to be a Catholic, to believe the doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Catholic who denies one doctrine defined by the Church ceases to be a Catholic. The man who wilfully doubts, and expresses that doubt, about a doctrine of the Church, ceases to be a Catholic; so those persons in Italy and France who do not admit the truth of Catholic doctrine are not Catholics. But the great mass of the population, rich and poor, is Catholic, and is not at all represented by the views here referred to by Mr. Senor.

27223. The purport of my question was not to ask you whether you agree with Mr. Senor's statement—or even if I was aware you do not; but whether you believe that a feeling of that kind, namely, of the unfavourableness of Roman Catholic training to mental

development, might explain the fact that in the higher classes of society so many do not submit themselves to that complete control which the Roman Catholic bishops claim as their inalienable right?—I think, my lord, that Mr. N. Senor is altogether mistaken as to the feelings of the higher classes of Catholics; then refute that gentleman. We have several high Catholic schools in Ireland and England, which are filled with the children of the gentry and nobility of both countries. The schools of the Jesuits, or other schools conducted by ecclesiastical bodies are crowded with the sons of the highest and wealthiest Catholics. That shows that parents do not agree with Mr. Senor in his views, and that they are far from wishing to prevent their children from getting an education fully under the control of the Church.

27224. The number of exceptional cases is very considerable; how do you account for them?—There will be exceptional cases in everything in the world. Just as Mr. Senor says there are persons calling themselves Catholics in France who do not believe a word of Catholic teaching, so here, I suppose, there may be persons who will not obey the Church, just in the same way.

27225. This control of the bishops over the education of the people being an inherent right, and moreover an imperative duty, how do you account for the assertion of this right and the exercise of this duty having been so long allowed to remain in abeyance in this country?—I would account for it in the first place by the long persecutions to which Catholics were subjected, and by the existence of the penal laws.

27226. I mean since the establishment of the National Board?—The bishops always maintained their right, and never abandoned the duty of teaching. At the period referred to they thought that under the National system, with which they were not well acquainted, they could give a good religious Catholic education to children. Little by little the system developed itself in such a way as to prove that its tendency was hostile to Catholicity, and that Catholic youth was exposed to great danger in model and Protestant National schools, and that even in Catholic National schools religious teaching was subjected to unjust restrictions. All this being once known, the bishops did not delay to raise their voice against the system.

27227. Assuming the duty of directing and controlling the education of the young to be as essential and imperative as you have stated, do you think it was right, even for the sake of securing some advantage, to temporise so long in the matter?—I think it is proper to go slowly always, until you are sure you are right. I think it is proper you should go slowly until you are sure you are not taking a false step. It was a very serious matter for the bishops to determine to put themselves in opposition to the Government of the country, and to refuse such large assistance as was offered to them—so there were great reasons for temporising—great reasons for not rejecting the National system until it should be evident that it could not be worked without danger to religion.

27228. What practical necessity exists for the extension of that claim now, and for the exercise of the duty?—The spread of mixed education in many places, and the renewed efforts made to spread it widely everywhere, and develop it fully. To avoid the incense of an evil known by experience, the bishops became anxious to have denominational education established, in which the fitness of religious instruction might be given.

27229. In point of fact, has the faith or the morals of the people suffered materially, or at all—in other words, are the present generations worse in those respects than the generation that preceded them?—I think there can be no comparison at all between the present generation and those who preceded them in the last century.

27230. I mean the generation immediately preceding the present?—In the last century the Catholic people were all under persecution—no one could have a school or get any instruction, except what they

removed from the parish priests, or curates. In the last thirty years of the present century several of those parishes have continued in force, and the people were not accustomed to think themselves very safe, and were afraid of a renewal of the action of penal legislation. However, even in this uncertain state, during the first thirty years of this century the Catholic clergy made great efforts to establish schools. I saw it in a work lately published by Messrs Fitzgerald (Dublin in 1868), that in 1825 there were about 11,000 schools in Ireland, generally kept by Catholics, to which Government had contributed nothing or very little. That shows that the Catholics, and Catholic clergy were most anxious even at that time to promote education. Well, since Catholic Emancipation, greater efforts have been made. Almost every parish has got up a school or schools in his parish. I think nearly every bishop in Ireland has got up a seminary for the education of his clergy. A great many colleges have been established, a great deal has been done by the poor, by the middle classes, and by the gentry of the country to promote secular and religious education. Hence, though a thirst for religious education prevailed before Catholic Emancipation, greater and better opportunities for obtaining it have since been afforded to the people, and they have had advantages which were denied to their fathers.

27231. You said that in certain special cases you would not object to mixed schools, do you contemplate that any of these mixed schools should contain a Roman Catholic minority under a Protestant teacher?—I would be opposed to all such schools, if they can possibly be avoided. I would have all schools denominational. If there be an absolute necessity in a few localities for there be mixed schools, but on such terms that no one shall interfere with the religion of another.

27232. Would you in any case allow the children of your communion to be taught in a Protestant school, admitting they were the minority?—In some cases the system has been tolerated, because there was no other way of obtaining education.

27233. You would not object to it in such a case?—I would object to it always on principle, but I would tolerate it where the Catholics would be too few to get up a school for themselves—but where there were say large numbers I would not tolerate it, for the danger to faith would be increased in proportion to numbers, and there would be no necessity for such toleration, as each class could maintain its own school.

27234. As a matter of fact, would not the minority in such mixed schools consist in almost all cases of Protestant children?—I suppose it would be so in three provinces, in Munster, Leinster, and Connaught, where in general the Protestants are but few in proportion to the population. In the north circumstances might be different.

27235. You said that in such mixed schools under Roman Catholic teachers no change should be allowed in the books, or in the usual working of the school; but that the children of the minority should be compelled to retire when special religious education was about to be given. You would allow no change in the books or in the general conduct of the school for the sake of the minority?—I would have denominational schools for Catholics, and the ordinary teaching should be the same in the presence of a Protestant minority as if there was no Protestant in them, but when the special religious instruction would come on I would send away the Protestant children. That is the system which is carried out in France. It is laid down in the law of 1850, that if there be a sufficient number of Protestants, and a sufficient number of Catholics in a town, there must be two schools erected, one Catholic and one Protestant. If there be not a sufficient number to maintain two schools, then there may be a mixed school. The heads of each religious body as to be allowed to visit it. The moment religious instruction occurs, the children of a religion different from that at which the instruction is about to be given must be dismissed. The same system is adopted in purely Catholic schools in Ireland.

27236. In such mixed schools, being Roman Catholic, would you require that religious exercises should be still exhibited?—Oh, certainly, I would leave every thing just as usual. This is done in the schools of the Christian Brothers, and yet there is no interference with the religion of Protestant children if any ever attend.

27237. Would you also require that history should be taught out of Roman Catholic manuals in such mixed schools?—I would not make any change at all in the working of the Catholic school.

27238. Do you think that the faith of a Protestant child under such circumstances would be sufficiently secured by the fact of his being sent out of the school whenever special religious education was commenced?—My persuasion is that the mixture of various religious classes in schools exposes all to danger, but I have heard that in America a great number of Protestant children are educated by nuns, live in the house with them, and go through the schools the same as the Catholics, and yet remain Protestants after.

27239. Do you think that is the natural tendency of such associations?—I think it is not. I think the natural tendency is that the majority should produce a great impression on a small minority, and I think it is the natural tendency that the example of the teachers of one religion should exercise a very great influence upon the faith and morals of children of a different religion. On that account Catholics ought not to go to Protestant schools.

27240. In point of fact, a school permeated by an atmosphere of that kind—a Roman Catholic atmosphere—would not, on the ordinary principles of human nature, be a safe place to send a Protestant child to?—Certainly not, if the parent wishes to keep that child a thorough Protestant; and it is for a similar reason I would never like to see a Catholic child going to a Presbyterian or Protestant school, because the very fact of the teacher professing a different religion from that of the child will have an influence upon him. The children will know that a Protestant or Presbyterian teacher does not go to mass, does not go to confession, that he does not fast, that he does not obey the Catholic Church; and they may begin to think that they should not be required to be better than their master.

27241. You have stated, and you have confirmed your statement by the opinion of many eminent writers, that a purely secular education is not only an incomplete education, but in many respects injurious?—In my opinion a merely secular education is fraught with danger; learned men, when not religious, have been the greatest scourges of society. Greece and Rome, at the time of the apostles, were filled with learned writers and profound philosophers, but their learning and philosophy did not prevent them from becoming the greatest oppressors that ever appeared on the face of the earth, as we learn from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, &c.

27242. Religious teaching is an essential element of education, and as much as possible it should be incorporated with and permeate every other department of learning?—I am altogether of that opinion. I think education, to be worthy of the name, should prepare a man adequately to fulfil his destiny. He has one destiny in this world, another in the world to come. It is only a short, miserable space of time a man has to live here; he has to live for ever and ever in the next world. A man is bound to know how to discharge his duties in this world, but his great and important duty is to prepare for the other world, and he ought therefore to devote himself to the practice and study of religion.

27243. Now, if, from the operation of circumstances, political or otherwise, this complete identifying of religious training with general education cannot be completely carried out, is it not desirable to carry it out as far as possible under the circumstances of the case?—That religious instruction should be attended to in every case.

27244. As far as possible?—It must be attended to in every case in one way or other. There must be a sufficient religious education, otherwise the secular

Feb. 25, 1869.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Feb 26, 1868.

His Reverence  
Cardinal  
Cullen

education will be of no real value, as it does not provide for eternity.

37343. What I mean is, if that complete incorporation of secular and religious education cannot be carried out perfectly and completely, is it not desirable to carry it out as far as possible?—My view of the case is, that every one must get a sufficient amount of true religious instruction to enable him to save his soul, otherwise he gets no education—he is not prepared for the other world. I may add that as persons possessing extraordinary religious doctrines cannot obtain proper and full religious instruction in a common school, as mixed education cannot be looked on as obtaining the most important object of education.

37344. Admitting this, was not the change which was made in the National system—the change which admitted the great fundamental truths of religion into the ordinary school curriculum—an improvement as far as it went?—I think not. I think it was calculated to do mischief to the great body of the children of this country. In the case of Catholic children, first it deprived them of the right of learning the special doctrines of Catholicity, and then it gave opportunities to a Protestant teacher to alienate them from the Catholic Church, and besides it was calculated to make children believe that what they were taught in school was paramount, and that what they were not taught in school was of very little importance.

37345. Is it not of great moment to recognize in the State schools, and to teach to all children, such doctrines as the existence of a Supreme Being, who governs the world by His providence, and who has revealed His will to His intelligent creatures: to read portions of that revealed Word, and to set forth such summaries of duty as are contained in the Ten Commandments?—It is certainly important; but it is more important to teach other truths of equal value—the divinity of our Divine Lord, the incarnation of our Divine Lord, His satisfaction for mankind, the authority of the Church, the Sacraments, and all other doctrines which are revealed to us, and committed to the charge of the Church. In the National books there is something about the existence of God; but I think in the whole of the National books you will find nothing about the Trinity of persons or the divinity of our Lord. He is called "our Lord," but there is nothing in the whole of the books to inculcate a belief in the Trinity or the divinity of our Lord. The important truths your lordship refers to are of great importance, but they should not exclude other essential truths.

37346. But the inculcation of such fundamental truths as I have mentioned is of itself important?—It is important. The papers used to inculcate many of them. But Catholics, to be true members of their Church, must believe many other truths.

37347. Was not the change to which I have referred, namely, the introduction of a certain amount of religious teaching into the curriculum of the National Board, cordially approved of by Archbishop Murray, and by most, if not all the Roman Catholic bishops, at the time?—I cannot say they approved—they allowed it to go on, they acquiesced in it—that is, they looked on to see how the experiment would turn out. I do not think there was any formal approbation ever given to the change. Dr. Murray always said the system was an experiment, he wished the experiment would turn out well, but I think his wishes and hopes were disappointed. Dr. Whately, it appears, looked on it as an experiment, but he penetrated more deeply into the matter, because he thought that by teaching the Scriptures, and getting the children to read it or his own tracts, he would soon raise doubts in their minds and shake the principle of authority upon which the Holy Catholic Church is founded.

37348. When was the Synod of Thurles held, and under whose presidency?—It was held in the year 1850—it commenced on the 22nd of August, and I think it lasted till the 16th of September. I had the honour of presiding over it.

37349. Was it after the deliberations of that

Synod that objections were first authoritatively made to the system of the National Board?—There were objections made by several bishops long before that time, and in 1834, a petition of the bishops was presented to Parliament in favour of purely Catholic education. I have handed in this petition. (See page 1181.)

37350. I mean by the authority of the collective Roman Catholic episcopate?—I believe the Synod of Thurles commenced the general united action against mixed education. In the year 1856—six years after, there was a declaration against it, signed by all the Catholic bishops. Again, in 1859, in 1865, and in 1864 or 1865, other resolutions against mixed education were unanimously adopted, which I have handed in to the Commission.

37351. Am I right in supposing it that the first authoritative and deliberate exposition of the opinions of the Irish Roman Catholic prelates was made in the Synod of Thurles, against the National system?—The Synod of Thurles was the first National synod held in Ireland in this century: it did not enter into the general question of mixed education, except so far as concerned the Queen's Colleges. The synod, then, indeed, objected to mixed education as carried out in the National schools, but proposed modifications and safeguards, which would be sufficient, at least in the way of experiment, to secure the children from any danger of falling into errors against faith and morals.

37352. These safeguards did not extend so far as you now require—to a purely denominational system?—The bishops required substantially, the denominational system, but did not ask it by name; if faith and morals were safe, they did not care about a name.

37353. Archbishop Whately, to whom you have just referred laid most stress upon the Scripture Extracts as a means of enlightening the minds of the Roman Catholics?—Removing the darkness of superstition, as he says.

37354. By the Scripture Extracts?—Yes; and he stated also that the National system was gradually undermining the vast fabric of Romanism in Ireland.

37355. Chiefly, as I believe he expressed himself, from the fact of that system incorporating so much of the Scripture in its teaching?—He thought that would be a great means of undermining the vast fabric of Romanism.

37356. Were not these Scripture Extracts sanctioned by the three Roman Catholic Archbishops of Dublin?—They were tolerated.

37357. If Dr. Murray had been convinced that they were essentially wrong in themselves, would he have sanctioned them?—I suppose he would not, but just as in reference to the system in general, he wished to make an experiment as to the effect they would produce. If he had known the views expressed by Dr. Whately in his conversations—since published—I am certain his feeling regarding these books and the system generally, would have been totally changed.

37358. Archbishop Whately says—

"Archbishop Murray and I agreed in desiring large portions of the Bible to be read in our National schools; but we agreed in this because we disagreed as to its probable results—he believed they would be favourable to Romanism—I believed they would be favourable to Protestantism—and I feel confident that I was right."

Is there any reason to doubt the truth of that statement?—I have no reason to doubt that they were acting in very different ways. Dr. Whately assenting in the Reports of the Board that penalization was strictly prohibited, said he was undermining Catholicity by promoting the National system, but with one hand had behind his back, Dr. Murray never had the least idea of impugning Protestantism in any way. His only anxiety was to procure a good education for Catholic children, leaving Protestants to themselves. That is the difference between the two prelates. One was trying to weaken Catholicity—the other never attempted to assail Protestantism.

37359. If Archbishop Whately knew Dr. Murray's reasons for desiring the introduction of the Scripture Extracts, is it not probable that Archbishop Murray

know his Archbishop Whately's?—I do not think so. They were not very intimate. They met at the Board, but I do not think they ever visited, or had a private conversation in their lives.

37282 Is it not altogether unlikely, or improbable?

—I dare say they used to meet frequently at the National Board meetings, but I do not think it probable that they spoke about private views or designs, or that Dr. Whately would acquaint Dr. Murray with those opinions expressed in private conversation, and recorded by Mr. N. Senior.

37283 If Archbishop Whately strongly believed that secular education would be incomplete without the religious element, and that this religious element could be introduced into National schools only by portions of the Scriptures against which no religious denomination objected, was he not justified in making every effort to introduce such Scripture lessons?—I do not think he was justified in excluding Catholic doctrine from Catholic schools, or in compelling Catholic children to give up without being able to acquire a full knowledge of Catholic truth in their own National schools. I consider Dr. Whately for that as well as for his wickedness proslavery or his attempts to undermine Romanism, as he says.

37284 But, being convinced of the necessity of incorporating religion with secular education, and feeling that there was no other means of doing it, except by the introduction of portions of Scripture against which no religious denomination objected, was he not justified in introducing these Scripture Extracts?—Perhaps he thought he was justified, but if he looked across the Channel and saw what they were doing in his own country, he could not have imagined that united religious education was necessary, whereas the denominational system is in full work in England. However, he introduced a system which leaves Catholics without a knowledge of the most essential matters. Take his little book, "Lessons of Christianity." I have read it, and I could never find out in it a trace of the Trinity of persons in God, or of the Divinity of our Lord, or of the substitution for the sake of men on the Cross. There is a sequel to that book. It was not printed by the Board, but it was circulated by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and it contains attacks upon almost every Catholic doctrine. Being a sequel to a National school book, children probably would be tempted to read it. This was scarcely fair.

37285 Archbishop Whately had clearly contemplated and carefully considered the denominational system. You read a passage yesterday, which I shall read again, "What I fear is a measure which though not severely sectarian may be so practically. I fear that a grant may be offered to any person who will provide such secular education as the Government may approve, leaving him to furnish such religious education as he may himself approve." "If this be done, the schools of the Roman Catholic dissenters will be so many Maynooths, so many hotheds of bigotry and religious animosity, not will the Protestant schools be much better. The great object of the training in such will be controversial theology, and secular instruction, and even moral instruction, will be neglected." How we have his objections to the denominational system very strongly stated, showing that he could not sleep at ease on the basis of religious teaching?—I do not agree with him at all. I think he was wholly mistaken in his views on that point. If we look to what occurs in practice, we will find there is less bigotry, less contention, where the education is denominational, than in mixed schools. I think the Protestants of England have not seen so much bigotry or intolerance as the Protestants of Ireland. I think the Catholics of England are just the same in that respect as the Protestants, they have no prejudices, they have no disputes with Protestants, so the denominational system there produces no bad effects. We see also that the gentry of Ireland who are educated at denominational schools, the Catholic gentry and Protestant gentry, get on very well. The only per-

sons I see fighting are those in districts where they have mixed schools. I must add that Dr. Whately was not justified in insinuating that Maynooth and other Catholic seminaries are hotheds of bigotry and religious animosity.

37286 My object in quoting that passage was this—Archbishop Whately was anxious to have a religious element embodied in the school teaching, he had strong objections, which he here states very forcibly, against denominational schools, and, therefore, the only course open to him in this mixed education was the introduction of such an amount of religious teaching as all would accept. From his point of view was he not therefore justified in introducing the Scripture Extracts?—I think he was quite wrong. I think he was quite wrong in his views upon that subject. I think that when he wished to have religion introduced into the schools, he ought to have said let every class get a knowledge of their own religion—let the Protestants get a full knowledge of their own doctrines—let Catholics learn their own doctrine, and the teaching and practices of their own Church, just as they do in England. Why deprive Catholics or Protestants of the knowledge of those doctrines which distinguish them from one another, and from every other class in society? I think Dr. Whately was altogether wrong in his views upon that point.

37287 If Dr. Whately moreover believed that the effect of such even partial Scriptural knowledge would be from the nature of the case to lead the Roman Catholic pupils to think for themselves on the great subject of religion, was there any treachery in his allowing this purpose to work itself out?—If he knew what the Catholic doctrines were, in regard to the authority of the Church, and if he wished to shake the faith of Catholics in the Church, he was acting treacherously. What is his position? He professed that there was not the least danger of proselytism in the National system—that is put forward continually in the reports of the Board signed by him—and he tells his friends privately at the same time that he was fighting the battle of Protestantism, but at great disadvantage, on account of the opposition given to him by Protestant clergymen, he was fighting the battle with one hand, and that his best, tied behind his back, but that still he was undermining the vast fabric of popery.

37288 Archbishop Whately was anxious, as we all are, that the schools should contain a religious element, and the only way in which that religious element could be introduced was by the admission into the school books of certain portions of Holy Scripture. He felt himself bound as a Christian, to say nothing of his being a Christian protestant, so to communicate that knowledge which he considered essential to the children, he at the same time believed that the natural result of reading these portions of Scripture would be to open the eyes of the children, and to induce them to read the Scriptures more extensively, which would raise certain doubts in their minds as to the infallibility of the Church to which they belonged, and lead them to espouse the doctrines of Protestantism. Do you think that in acting thus, he was acting treacherously? These was no proselytism, the effects were produced by the Bible itself; he could not help that?—I think His Grace could have found out a very easy way of avoiding all that difficulty. If he wished to introduce the religious element, he might have declared that he wished for denominational schools—let every class have their own schools—let every class have full religious education according to their own views. As to his wishing to promote the reading of the Scripture and the knowledge which could be acquired by doing so, it is quite clear from his own assertions that he was encouraging this system of reading the Scripture Extracts with the view of undermining—or he says himself, the vast fabric of Catholicity in Ireland. He was doing it knowingly and deliberately, and he says himself, that he was fighting the battle of Protestantism with one hand, and that his best, tied behind his back. He was directly assailing Catholicity, not

Feb 24, 1868.

His Reverence  
Cardinal  
Cullen

Feb. 25, 1880. leaving restlers to the natural course of things, and at the same time telling Catholics that they were quite safe from proselytism.

His Grace  
Cardinal  
Cullen

Now as regards the word proselytism—if you allow me, I will explain what I mean by it. These are different degrees of proselytism. Proselytism is the depriving the soul of its true life, by depriving it of faith. It is just like murder which kills the body. Sometimes murder is committed directly, and by violence, sometimes indirectly, gradually, and stealthily, for example, by not giving sufficient food, by administering slow poisons, or by placing a person in a pestiferous atmosphere. The same is to be said of proselytism. It is carried on by those who would Catholics without any concealment—declaring them to be idolaters—and attributing everything bad to them. At other times proselytism is carried on gradually, by depriving the soul of its proper nutriment, by depriving it of the instruction which is necessary for faith. And this kind of proselytism is attributable to the National Board, for it leaves the children at the mercy of the managers who may prohibit the teaching of religion altogether in the school. The rule also of the Board which excludes all religious doctrines, except the few principles common to Protestants and Catholics, from the schools, sanctions this system, and injures Catholics by leaving them without a knowledge of some of the most important truths of their religion. There is another system of proselytism which gradually and by natural agencies, weakens the faith of Catholics. Keeping company continually with Protestant children and teachers will weaken the faith of a Catholic child, and that is an indirect sort of proselytism. Dr. Whately believed that indirect proselytism was going on in various ways, well adopted gradually to shake the convictions of Catholics, and at the same time he accused the Catholics that their faith was exposed to danger.

27269. If Dr. Whately was thoroughly convinced that such would be the natural result of this mixed religious education, namely, that the faith of Roman Catholic children might be shaken in the infallibility of their Church, do you consider that he ought to have withdrawn from the Board, and that, in not doing so, he was a traitor to his professions of liberality?—I think he ought to have told the world that he considered the system bad that tendency, and that he should not have told them what he did in the reports of the Board, that there was no danger whatsoever of proselytism, no danger whatever to the faith of Catholics in these schools. He repeats that continually in the reports. That is where I find the objection against Dr. Whately's conduct. I do not disagree with Dr. Whately for what he believed himself—for his convictions, nor do I know what they were, but if he was convinced he was acting in accordance with justice and truth, still he was doing as a wrong in telling the people there was no danger of proselytism in the system, and writing and saying at the same time that mixed education supplied by the National Board was undermining the very fabric of Catholicity in the country. He was acting in opposition to his professions.

27270. Did Dr. Whately ever declare, or in his conduct did he ever give it to be understood that, he considered it to be libelous or to be untrue to affirm to the Church of England any Roman Catholic who might be led to doubt the grounds of his own faith by reading the Scriptures, or in any other way?—I do not know what his conduct upon that point was. I read his life written by his daughter, and I think it is stated that if any priest was excommunicated in the Catholic Church he would not receive him into the Protestant Church. But at the same time he states that the Catholic priests were ignorant, and ill instructed in Scripture, ignorant, and thinking only of their own interests, so that he could not put any confidence in them. This does not show that he was exempt from prejudice. Your lordship asked me in an earlier part of the afternoon something about the improvement since the institution of the National system, and I had no opportunity of answering the question.

27271. Is there anything in the circumstances of the rising generation of Roman Catholic children in this country which renders it practically necessary to take precautions for their faith and morals, which were not deemed necessary in the last generation?—Most certainly. They are very much more in communication with foreign countries than the past generations were. There is continual communication between Ireland and America, and your lordship is aware, that according to the statements made by Protestant bishops, there are about fifteen millions of citizens in America, who believe in no religion, and a communication with a population of that kind must tend very much to weaken the faith of the people of Ireland. There is, besides, great communication with countries nearer home. The Irish are going over every day to England and Scotland, and in those countries they are often thrown into districts where they have no clergy to attend to them, where they have no churches to worship in, according to the principles of their own religion. Thus they are exposed to many dangers if they are not well instructed in religion; but if well instructed they may be able to preserve their faith, and fight their way. Besides, there are great facilities open to the people of reading the worst papers and bad books. I mentioned the first day I was examined here that multitudes of these books are circulated even in Ireland. There are numbers of newspapers of a low class which contain a great many things against faith and morals. There are also numbers of novels, often sold at the railway stations for a trifle, and put into the hands of the poor. Faith and morals are continually assailed in these books. On account of these circumstances I think the people require to be better educated than ever.

27272. Mr. Stokes.—In your Eminence prepared to bear testimony to an improvement, or the contrary, under the system as now administered by the National Board?—I am prepared to bear testimony to an improvement in the assembly and in the knowledge of the country since the establishment of the National Board; but I would not venture to say that that improvement is due altogether, or due to any great extent, to the operations of the National Board. You recollect that the National Board was established immediately after Catholic Emancipation. At that time, or shortly before it, Catholics began to build churches, and have since covered the whole country with them; they began to establish convents, orphanages, schools, and religious houses of every kind; so that a great improvement was made in that respect certainly by Catholics themselves. The National schools were also an improvement in many cases. Where the parents were Catholic, and the masters all Catholic, the children all Catholic, there is no doubt the schools produced useful results, and contributed to spread enlightenment in the country. But there was another reason for great improvement. The Catholic clergy began about the year 1825 or 1826—soon after Catholic Emancipation—to give "missions" throughout the country. Almost every parish in Ireland must have had a mission in it since that time. These missions were the cause of the greatest improvement in the morals of the country, and consequently of the almost benefit to society. I recollect in 1831 Ribbonism prevailed to an alarming extent in part of the diocese of Armagh, and several murders were committed. I got the missionaries of St. Vincent de Paul to give a mission at Dundalk, and some time later they gave a mission at Crossmaglen. In the course of a few months they banished Ribbonism altogether from the country, and there has scarcely been a trace of it in the district since. In that way I think an immense improvement has been produced in the country since the establishment of the National Board, to some extent through the agency of the National Board, but still more through other causes. Probably if the National Board had never been thought of, the improvement by some attributed to it would have occurred through the schools that were in operation before its establishment. A large proportion of the schools that

are now "National schools" were common parochial schools at that time; little by little they would have developed themselves, and probably the same effects would have been produced, with this difference, that the National schools have cost the country six millions sterling, while the other schools would have cost the State nothing.

27273. Mr. Deane.—Is the Crossmaglen, your Emancipation has just mentioned, the same place that is in the neighbourhood of Carrickmacross, which is referred to in Mr. Trevel's book, "Realities of Irish Life," as a hot-bed of Ribbonism?—I cannot say, I have not read that book.

27274. Is it in the Farney district?—It is about 10 miles to the north-west of Dundalk. Farney is in the diocese of Clogher; Crossmaglen is in the diocese of Armagh. Farney is in the county Monaghan.

27275. Crossmaglen being so near the barony of Farney, is it not possible that one of the causes of getting rid of Ribbonism in that district—for which Mr. Trevel takes the sole credit to himself in his book—was the labours of the Vincentian Fathers who gave the mission there?—I am quite sure the mission and recommendations of Mr. Trevel only served to increase Ribbonism, while the persisting and labours of the missionaries did an immensely to get on and to it.

27276. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—How do you account for the influence and teaching of the Vincentians having a greater effect upon the people than the influence and teaching of their own parochial clergy?—Their own parochial clergy have a great influence, but then that is the ordinary influence, to which people get accustomed, and which does not produce extraordinary effects. But when strange clergymen of great literary acquirements, great power in preaching, of piety and zeal—who have devoted themselves specially to these labours, spend some time overhauling a people, their efforts must produce a most beneficial effect, even though they previously may have had the best possible clergymen amongst them. The new influence always affects the people.

27277. Lord Clarendon.—Your Emancipation is, I believe, aware that difficulty has arisen in obtaining sites for schools?—I have heard that occasionally difficulty has been experienced. In this diocese, however, I have heard but few complaints, as the gentry have been very good in giving sites. However, there may have been some few instances where sites could not be obtained.

27278. Is it your Emancipation's opinion that that difficulty has arisen?—I will not say altogether, but in some degree from the unwillingness of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to allow the landed gentry to be patrons of schools upon their own estates?—I do not think that in this part of the country, the landed proprietors have shown any great anxiety to be patrons of schools, and if in any case the bishops did not wish that they should be patrons, there must have been some reason. Offences the landed gentry have been very hostile to the Catholics of this country, and treated their Catholic tenants severely. Many of the landed gentry are supporters of proselytizing societies. You will often see the names of a great many of the landed gentry in the lists of subscribers to these societies. I happened to have put into my pocket to-day a report of one of them, "The Irish Church Mission Society," which is proselytizing and aggressive in its character, and has carried on an active and most unparliamentary war on Catholicity in the west of Ireland. Now, in this report, among the subscribers to this aggressive society, we find the names of several landed proprietors, or of other members of the Protestant gentry. Thus in the report for 1865, now in my hand, I find the names of the Earl of Belmore, Lord Mayo, Lord Charles Hamilton, Lord Gough, Vice-Admiral Pakenham, the Right Hon. Joseph Napier, the Earl of Roden, Lord Clonville, the Lord Primate Beresford, the Lord Bishop of Tuam, and hundreds of others. While so many of the gentry encourage an odious and violent system of proselytism, it is not to be expected that

Catholics would be anxious to see them managing the education of their children.

27279. Allow me to recur to this subject. Would your Emancipation be disposed to allow a landed proprietor to be patron of a school which he builds upon his property, upon condition of absolute non-interference on his part with the religious education of the children?—If the patron allowed the full teaching of the Catholic faith, and of Catholic practices, and if there were no danger to faith or morals, I would have no difficulty about allowing him to be patron. I have no objection to a school conducted by a layman, provided he teach Catholic doctrine, and prevent the spread of error, and abstain from giving any bad example to the people. In the same way I would have no objection to a lay patron.

27280. Might not the landed proprietor be permitted to appoint the master of the school, provided there should be an approval on the part of the Roman Catholic clergyman of the faith and morals of the master so appointed?—I suppose the Catholic clergyman would raise no difficulty at all, unless on the ground that the landlord was an enemy of his religion, or interfered improperly with religion in the parish. If he knew that the landlord had no bad feeling against Catholics, and if at the same time the landlord appointed a proper teacher, I do not think any clergyman would object.

27281. The case I submitted to your Emancipation is one where the landed proprietor undertakes that there should be absolutely no interference whatever with the religious education of the children?—Well, a person sometimes undertakes things which he does not carry out, or intend to carry out. So you must examine into the particular case to know what are all the circumstances. If the landlord were a subscriber to proselytizing societies, I would not so trust in him as a manager of a school for Catholics.

27282. Should you be disposed to agree to the opinion of a Roman Catholic priest, that the offer to establish a school upon such a system as I have sketched out, was one of the most dangerous forms of religious persecution?—It depends upon the circumstances. I cannot form an opinion at all upon a general case put in that way. I give you the principle I go on, but I could not speak about a particular case without knowing all the details on both sides. You cannot form an opinion upon any disputed question without hearing the reasons pro and con.

27283. Am I to understand your Emancipation to say there would be no objection on your part to a landed proprietor being patron of a school on his own property, and his having the appointment of the master, on the condition of absolute non-interference with religious education, and also on the condition that the Roman Catholic clergyman should approve altogether of the faith and morals of the master so appointed?—If there were a moral certainty that the patron would carry out his promises, and that the master would be such as you have described, I think a Catholic priest would have no difficulty at all about consenting to such a proposal. If a Protestant gentleman came to me, and I knew him to be a very liberal man—a man quite determined not to interfere with the religion of Catholics, and told me that he would appoint a master as my recommendation to the school, I would accept the proposal with thankfulness.

27284. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Is there not a very large number of National schools under Roman Catholic management in Ireland?—A great number. There are I think altogether 4,267 schools under Catholic patrons.

27285. Now in the National schools under Roman Catholic patron or managers has there not always been ample opportunity given to the managers and teachers to impart to Roman Catholic children any amount of dogma and Catholic doctrine they desire—at fixed hours?—In school-time itself there is so much opportunity given. Religious emblems are prohibited in the schools, and every reference to Catholicity is carefully excluded from the books. Besides, it is

Vol. 20, 1867.

His Emancipation  
Catholic  
Catholics.

Feb. 26, 1883.

His Reverend  
Father  
Cullen.

strictly prohibited to teach anything in school hours but the principles of common Christianity, whatever they may be. Besides, it is not always possible outside the hours of school to teach the children all the doctrines which are necessary for them in order to be good Catholics. You know the people are poor, the children poor, and oftentimes in very great distress. They cannot be got to school before the hours at which the regular school business commences, to receive religious instruction. Oftentimes they cannot get breakfast in time to go before school hours. They cannot be kept after school hours because the half-starved children are weary, broken down with the fatigue of the day and anxious to get home—and if they were kept after the regular school hour in order to receive religious instruction they would look upon it as a penance, and they would become rather hostile than otherwise to the learning of Catholics and the receiving of religious instruction.

27295. May not the managers and teacher have one hour daily at the beginning or close of school business for imparting religious dogma to Roman Catholic children?—They may, but it is very difficult to get young children together at that time, on account of the condition of the parents; and therefore it is not proper that during the school hours special reference to religion should be prohibited.

27296. I think I misinformed you to say on a former day that the *system* is now given to parents and not to pastors as you alleged it was in the beginning, as to religious instruction?—That appears to be the general tendency of the system—to introduce a sort of Presbyterianism, to vest the power of giving religious instruction in the people and not in the hands of the clergy.

27297. Has not parental authority been invariably recognised as a fundamental principle of the system of National education?—In the first rules laid down the clergy were mentioned as the persons destined to give religious instruction. The time to be devoted to religious education was to be fixed and the quality of the religious education was to be determined by the clergy. The position of the clergy now is totally changed. To give religious instruction the clergy must be approved of by the parents. This is not in conformity with the Catholic system, in which we have pastors divinely appointed by the Holy Ghost, not by man, to feed the flock.

27298. Are matters of fact are you aware that Archbishop Whately testified that parental authority was recognised as a fundamental principle of the system from the beginning?—Yesterday I read a passage from Archbishop Whately and another from Archbishop Sheehan which showed that they did not owe any such acknowledgment. Both these passages were taken from their evidence before the Lords' Committee in 1834. So that if they professed great respect for parental authority they have not been consistent with themselves. Dr. Whately says the Board did not take parental authority into consideration at all. See his words, p. 1251.

27299. As a matter of fact, however, are you not aware that the system was regulated from the first as one not sustaining the Roman Catholic parent, or a clergyman of any denomination, imposing his religious instruction upon the children of even his own religious denomination?—I do not think that Catholics ever impose religious instruction upon any denomination but their own. They do not impose it even on their own. All Catholics look up to the priests as ministers appointed by God, to give them religious instruction; and when they are listening to the instruction of their clergy, they consider it is coming from God—not from anyone appointed by man. There is nothing imposed on them.

27300. But as a matter of fact, have not the parents always been the parties entitled to prescribe the religious instruction of their children from the first?—Of course parents are obliged to provide religious instruction for their children from their infancy. But you must distinguish between different classes of parents.

27292. I ask the fact in connection with the history of the Board?—I must take a distinction as to the character of the parents. If parents have no religion they may be satisfied with the rule of the Board, that all religions may be excluded from the schools. If parents believe that the Catholic Church teaches the truth, and that they are obliged to be members of the Catholic Church, then they can allow no one but Catholics to give religious instruction to their children—and they can allow their children to receive nothing but Catholic religious education—that is a consequence of the belief of Catholics.

27293. I understood you to have said on a former day, that the power at first in this matter, was given to the pastor and not to the parents—that I understood you to state as a fact?—It is a fact, according to the rules as originally laid down.

27294. I wish to read to you a statement of Mr. Macdonnell, the Resident Commissioner?—When did he make it?

27295. In 1854?—That was long after, in the beginning of the system.

27296. "What is very important in point of strict principle under our plan is, that the Roman Catholic priest has no power to impose religious instruction upon his own Roman Catholics. The alteration suggested in the rule would, for the first time, give the power to the Roman Catholic priest to impose upon his own flock any religious instruction he pleased." Do you regard Mr. Macdonnell, in 1854, as a gentleman well acquainted with the system, and qualified by his knowledge and experience of the working of the system to testify to this as a fact?—I think his statement is not conformable to the rule laid down by Lord Stanley, in his first letter for the institution of the Board. The very thing Mr. Macdonnell states there shows the hostility of the system to Catholic doctrine, because Catholics look up to their pastors as the authorised ministers of religious instruction. Every Catholic regards them as such.

27297. Is it not the fact that the Board of Education, by a minute of the 10th of April, 1832, declared their recognition of parental authority, and that the ministers, to give religious instruction, must themselves be recognised by the parents of the children to be instructed?—I referred to Lord Stanley's first letter. After that the Board began to make changes, and continued to change down to 1835, when the last changes, I believe, were made.

27298. I shall send to you from the minute of the Board?—Will you be so good as to let me hear Mr. Macdonnell's words, if you please.

27299. I do not quote Mr. Macdonnell's words now. I refer to a minute of the Board of Education, dated 10th of April, 1832?—Is it published in the reports?

27300. Yes?—I have the reports here. Will you be so good as to give me the page that I may have it under my observation.

27301. I am reading from the evidence of the Rev. Dr. Henry, page 1152, vol. II of the evidence of 1834.

"By the minute of the Board of Education of the 10th of April, 1832, it was resolved that it be recommended to His Majesty's Government to pervert the Board to other Regulations, &c. so as to stand as follows—namely, that all books required for religious instruction shall be sent under the sanction of the ministers recognised by the parents of the children for whose instruction they are employed."

In that minute, on early on April, 1832, did not the Board recognise the parents of the children as the parties entitled to say who should give religious instruction to the children?—I think not. It gave the parents of the respective denominations the right of determining the books. The religion of the children is to be determined by their parents. We do not know who is a Catholic child or who is a Protestant child except upon the testimony of their parents. At the same time those words give the parents the right of determining the books for religious instruction.

27302. I refer now to the statement in the Eleventh Report of the Commissioners, vol. I, page 270?—What year?



27303. The year 1834. They say, "In respect of the fundamental principle, that of *excluding all interference, positive or negative, with conscientious scruples*, the Commissioners have no discretion." The principle is that referred to in the previous page, paragraph 33—namely—

"The principle of it is, and has been from the beginning, that the National schools shall be open alike to Christians of all denominations, and that accordingly no child shall be required to be present at any religious instruction or exercise of which his parents or guardians may disapprove."

Is not parental authority recognised by the Commissioners themselves as a fundamental principle of the system?—That is quite different from what we find in the original rules. "No child shall be present" are the words in the original rules. The sense is changed in what you quote by introducing the word *required*.

27304. Is your Evidence prepared to acknowledge that that is the report of the Commissioners of Education?—As you have read it I suppose I can have no doubt about it. What I wish to say is, that I do not concur at all in the views of the Commissioners. I think they changed the system when they made that rule; because in the first place Catholic children cannot get that full religious education which at first was promised; in the second place, they are exposed to learn things which they ought not to learn. I read yesterday a report of the May-play-school school in Belfast, and of the examination of the Rev. Mr. Campbell, in which both the master of the school and the Rev. Mr. Campbell stated that there was nothing to prevent them, when expounding the books, from introducing any religious doctrine they wished—they were both Presbyterians—so if they wished to introduce Presbyterian doctrine there was no protection whatever for the Catholic children under the rule you have quoted.

27305. To come back to this—as a matter of fact should you be prepared to acknowledge that the Commissioners of that day were parties to be relied upon in testifying as to this being a fundamental principle of the system?—I do not doubt but they considered it a fundamental principle; but I think it was a very bad fundamental principle—one from which I differ altogether, and which changed the original system.

27306. Is your Evidence aware that this report was signed by three Catholic Commissioners—by your predecessor, Archbishop Murray, by Mr. Blake, and by Mr. Cuthbert?—I think my predecessor and the other Commissioners went along when they consented to introduce mixed education in Ireland, I think they made a very false step. They thought they might alter the mixed system as an experiment, but the experiment has not succeeded; I do not approve of what they did. I have been endeavouring to show in my evidence that they were mistaken in their views of mixed education.

27307. The Commissioners of that day declared that this was a principle in respect to which they had no discretion, and from which they could not depart. On what ground could they have said that they had no discretion as to matters of departure from that principle?—Because I think they had themselves very much misled by their own imaginations. They said nothing would be introduced into the books which would not be in conformity with the convictions of every denomination of Christians. I think there are a great many things in the books which Quakers or some of the Baptists or other sects would not admit, and there are many things contrary to Catholic teaching. Besides, if you wish to be logical, Jews, Hindus, and Mahomedans ought to have a full right to be in the schools, because there are some of them as much subjects of Her Majesty as any Protestants or Presbyterians or Catholics; and according to the principle of the Commissioners, the books ought to exclude everything opposed to their opinions. There are some Jews in India, there is a Hindoo or two, natives of India, and if you lay down that general principle that nothing contrary to the principles of any religious section of Her Majesty's subjects should be taught in the

schools, I do not see why you should proclaim in the National books that Christ is the Lord.

27308. Do you regard the statement in Mr. Stanley's letter as to the "clergy" approving, as designed to give them the right of controlling the religious education of the children, in any case in opposition to the wishes of the parents or guardians of the children?—I do not understand the question well.

27309. I think you declared your belief to be that at the origin of the system the clergy were the parties to have the guidance and control of religious instruction?—Yes of all Catholic religious instruction. I suppose Presbyterians have got a different system. Presbyterians hold that their ministers of religion are appointed by themselves, and receive powers from the congregation, but Catholics think that a priest when ordained becomes a minister of God, and receives his powers through the channel instituted by Christ.

27310. The question is in reference to the paragraph in Lord Stanley's letter, do you believe the statement as to the clergy giving religious instruction, was designed to confer on them the right of controlling the religious education of the children in any case in opposition to the wishes of the parents or guardians?—I do not know what the object of Lord Stanley was in writing the letter. But I think that his letter indicates that the Catholic clergy would be allowed under the new system to exercise their full right of teaching religious doctrine and protecting their children from error.

27311. But irrespective of the wishes of the parents of the children, I refer to the provisions of Lord Stanley's letter?—I think the words there indicate that the Catholic clergy were to have their full right, and that is the explanation given to it by Mr. Curdwell in his letter to the Catholic bishops.

27312. Irrespective of the wishes of the parents?—We never exercise the right irrespective of the wishes of the parents; but if the parents wish to remain good Catholics, they must listen to the Church. At the same time if parents wish to become Jews or Mahomedans, and educate their children accordingly, we can only admonish them of their duty, and point out the guilt they incur.

27313. Are you not aware on a fact that many Roman Catholic parents do exercise their own right in opposition to the wishes of the clergy?—Do they teach their children what we consider false doctrine?

27314. As to the matter of fact?—I am aware that Roman Catholics steal and curse, and commit other crimes. So a Catholic might, believing in the Church himself, sanction the fault of his children; but by doing so he would sin, and virtually deny his own religion.

27315. In the very first report of the Commissioners, that for 1834, did they not declare that the teaching of the clergy was subject to the approval of the parents or guardians. I shall read the passage, vol. I, page 13, No. 2—"One day in each week (independently of Sunday) is to be set apart for religious instruction of the children, on which day such pastors or other persons as are approved of by the parents or guardians of the children shall have access to them for that purpose." Does not that rule, so early as 1834, give to the parents the right to choose and appoint pastors for the children?—If it gave that right, the rule conveyed a denial of Catholic doctrine, and we should look on it as heretical. The way it was interpreted was that the parish priests and clergy of the Catholic Church would be admitted to all schools to give Catholic instruction in force of their divine mission, in force of the authority given to them by God. Of course the pastors were recognised by their Catholic flocks.

27316. Does not No. 4 on same page confirm the principle that parents and not pastors had the right to control the religious education of the children from the first. "Any arrangement of this description that may be made is to be publicly notified in the schools in order that those children, and those only, may be present at the religious instruction whose parents or guardians approve of their being so?"—

Feb 23, 1869

His Evidence  
Continued  
Cath.

JUL 22, 1869.

His Excellency  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

That is quite clear. Catholics are not to be present at Protestant instruction, or Protestants at Catholic religious instruction. It was necessary that the religion of the children should be known, and it can be known only by the testimony of the parents.

27317 Did not the interpretation and action of the Commissioners in this matter, recognising parental authority as the basis of clerical or any other religious teaching, obtain the sanction of Lord Stanley himself?—If the Lord Lieutenant intended to grant the Catholic clergy authority to give religious instruction to Catholic children, he outstepped his power; he adopted a principle which was in full opposition to the teaching of the Catholic Church.

27318. You acknowledge that I cannot say that, because I do not know what were the Lord Lieutenant's intentions. But if the Lord Lieutenant and all the Lords and the House of Commons together, were to assume such a power, I would say they were all wrong. I would not yield to them in a matter of faith.

27319. Lord Stanley used the following language:—

"His Majesty's Government fully recognise the right of all to read the sacred Scriptures, but the exercise of this right in the case of infants must be subject to the control of their parents or natural guardians."

Does not that language explain Lord Stanley's meaning in his signed letter, and unequivocally recognise parental authority as a fundamental principle of the system?—I would be very sorry to adopt all Lord Stanley's sayings or decisions. If I did, I would come to be a Catholic. He lays down a principle there which is contrary to the discipline of the Catholic Church. He says parents have a right to order that the Scriptures should be read to their children. The Catholic Church denies that right. Lord Stanley and other persons connected with the Board sometimes adopt language which Catholics cannot admit.

27320. Did not the Commissioners on the very introduction of their system, prepare a document explanatory of some of the conditions which had been misunderstood, and which received the sanction of Government?—I must have seen it, I suppose.

27321. Are you aware the Commissioners particularly advert to the rule as to religious instruction, and declare the following:—Vol. I., page 7, paragraph 5.—your Excellency read part of it yesterday—allow me to read the whole. "By encouraging the pastors of different denominations to give religious instruction to the children of their respective flocks out of school-hours, the Board understood merely affording to such pastors facility of access to the pupils at the times specified—and not employing or remunerating them. And they understood that the parents and guardians of the children are to determine to what denomination they respectively belong.—the Board taking no cognizance of the matter."—It is quite clear. No one ever doubted about that. If you go into any house wishing to know of what religion are the young children, you must see the parents and ask them, and they will say that they are either Catholics or Protestants, as the case may be. Unless the parent tell their religion, how are we to know what the children are? There is nothing doubtful at all in stating what religion children profess. It is a mere matter of fact. A child of five or six years of age will not be able to swear as to its religion, and you must learn from the parents whether they are Catholics, Protestants, or Quakers.

27322. With regard to another matter referred to by your Excellency, I ask was not religious instruction to innocents of a different religious denomination from the patron to be given elsewhere, as the parents or guardians might provide, and not necessarily in the school—even from the first?—I think in the beginning it was to be in the school—that is, the parents had a full right to go to the school to give religious instruction to the children of their own flock.

27323. Will your Excellency allow me to read from the Eleventh Report of the Commissioners, page 271. They address his Excellency:—"Your Excellency will also observe, that we take care that all

children attending the National schools shall be allowed opportunities for receiving particular religious instruction, and will recollect that the Commissioners of 1812 distinctly say that it would be the duty of the ministers of religion to give it at other times and in other places?"—What year was that?

27324. The year 1844?—The rule regarding religious instruction had been changed long before that.

27325. When?—I am not well up to the date, though I have then noted down. It was changed gradually—fully changed about 1839—and then it underwent a further change at the instigation of Archdeacon Stedford, about the year 1847. I cannot now recall all the dates.

27326. Mr. Sullivan.—Was there any distinction in the first years between vested and unvested schools?—No distinction, and in all the schools at that time the rule was that religious instruction should be given in the school.

27327. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What time do you say that change took place?—I think from about 1835 to 1839, when the vested system was introduced; I think it was about that time.

27328. Are you aware that in the report of 1838 the Commissioners say "where any course of religious instruction is pursued in a school during school hours to which the parents of any of the children attending it object, the managers are to make an arrangement for leaving it given to those who are to receive it at a stated time or times, and in a separate place?—That was one of the changes. At first the rule was that no child should receive any religious instruction except such as was directed positively by their parents. In the release you quote it, a child may receive any religious instruction provided the parents do not object, and it may happen that though the parents disapproved of the religious instruction, they would not object, because they did not know what was going on in school. The difference between the two rules is quite evident, and the change is very serious.

27329. What was the character of the schools from the beginning of the system—were they large or small schools?—A great many of them were the same as at present. The greater number of the Catholic schools at that time became connected with the Board.

27330. What was the extent of their accommodation?—I could not tell you that.

27331. Was it supposed that the ministers of the different denominations should give religious instruction in those small school rooms to children of all religions, denominations at the same time?—If the schools were not suited for the purpose, the Commissioners made a great mistake in ordering that religious instruction should be given there.

27332. Are you not aware that Lord Stanley stated the instruction should be given separately?—All religious instruction should be given separately in the same school, that is, Catholic religious instruction to Catholics, and Protestant instruction to Protestant children, and there was to be no mixed religious instruction according to Lord Stanley's letter. At first the rule was joint literary and separate religious instruction. Then united literary and moral, and separate religious instruction, were prescribed. Then there was another change, and united moral and literary instruction, together with the teaching of the principles of common Christianity, was introduced for all. Then, in a few years, united religious instruction, most disastrous for Catholic children, was substituted for separate religious instruction, as originally prescribed.

27333. I ask you again where it was designed originally by Lord Stanley that the religious instruction should be given?—I think in the schools.

27334. And where there were three different religious denominations how could that be done?—I suppose he made a mistake in directing it to be done if it could not be done.

27335. Are you not aware the statement is that the remaining one or two days of the week be set apart for giving separate religious education to the children, how could the separate religious education be given

Feb 22, 1895.  
The Honorable  
Cordell  
Cullen

except in separate places—I think he ought to have considered the matter better before he laid down that rule, or he ought to have expressed himself better. His words clearly suppose that separate religious instruction was to be given in the schools. If you show that such a thing was impossible, Lord Stanley must have formed a false estimate of the state of our schools.

27336. Now, did I understand you to say a change took place in reference to the religious instruction rule in the words "to be present at"—I understood that rule was changed in the year 1847, finally changed. There was nothing added to the sentence but the particle "to."

27337. What do you mean by "finally changed," may I ask?—There were several changes up to that time.

27338. Regarding the word "to"—No, the whole sentence. At first the rule was—"No children shall be present." The last change was to—"No children shall be required to receive religious instruction or be present." Then it was changed again—"No child shall be compelled to receive religious instruction or be present." Then it was changed again—"No child shall be compelled to receive religious instruction or to be present." The "to" was added to settle the question at last.

27339. When do you say the change took place in regard to that rule?—I think changes were made successively from about 1833 up to 1847 when that change was finally made. Things went on gradually.

27340. Are you aware of this statement of the Commissioners—

"The principle of the system and which we consider fundamental, and really safe, is, that the National schools shall be open alike to the adherents of all denominations; therefore, that no child shall be required to be present at any religious instruction or exercises of which his parents or guardians may disapprove, and that exercises shall be afforded to all children to receive separately, and at particular periods such religious instruction as their parents or guardians may provide for them."

27341. When did that rule, in your opinion, begin to operate?—I do not know what the date of it is, but I suppose you will see from the date of the report, in which it was published. As to rule itself as promoting mixed schools, it certainly or it supposes, a false principle. If the principle were carried out, the children of all Her Majesty's subjects ought to be united in the same schools—Jews, Mohammedans, Turks, and Christians of every denomination, and thus all religious teaching beyond mere paganism would be rendered impossible.

27342. Are you prepared to admit that that was the rule of the Commissioners in operation so early as 1835?—I think when the Presbyterians joined them there was changed to suit their convenience.

27343. When did the Presbyterians join, may I ask?—Some of them joined, I think, about 1833.

27344. When you speak of the Presbyterians joining may I ask what is the definite idea you attach to the words?—I do not mean to say all the Presbyterians, but that some congregations joined the Board at that time. I suppose others of them have not joined yet. I am not quite sure.

27345. Are you aware several of them joined from the beginning?—Some of them did.

27346. To what national fact do you refer to show when the Presbyterians joined?—The fact I refer to is a letter to the Reports from the Education Office, dated July 26th, 1835, written I think to the Rev. Mr. Love, admitting his school. He was a Presbyterian minister, who had a school down in the north, which was admitted in that year. But it is expressly declared in the letter of Mr. Kelly, the secretary at that time, "that such children only as were permitted by their parents to attend at religious instruction be then allowed to continue in the school." The children should be permitted by their parents. After words that was changed. The children "should not be compelled," which is quite different thing. Then in the next place the letter says, "the Commissioners desire me to ob-

serve that it is of the essence of their rules that religious instruction should be given only at the times specifically appointed for that purpose, and that children whose parents do not direct (i.e., give positive orders to) them to be present at it should previously retire." Those were the conditions upon which the Presbyterian school was admitted to communion with the Board.

27347. Is there any proof that in non-vested schools from 1833 onward the master was ever required to exclude a child from religious instruction?—According to the letter now quoted, and according to the statements of some of the Commissioners, he was required to do so.

27348. Can you give a case?—The letter referred to absolutely requires it; and if you take the evidence of Mr. Blake, who was one of the Commissioners, you will find that he declared before Parliament, or before a Parliamentary Commission, that the Commissioners absolutely required that children of one denomination should not be present at the religious instruction given by those of another denomination, and he adds that that was the very essence of the system, and that that system was necessary in order to prevent "irreconcilable" Catholics, he says, might trick Presbyterians, and Presbyterians might trick Catholics out of their religion unless that were enforced. I have quoted this passage yesterday. See p. 1222.

27349. Can you give any proof that in non-vested schools, from 1833 onward, the master was ever required to exclude a child from religious instruction?—If he observed the rules he was certainly obliged to do so.

27350. But you cannot furnish a case in proof?—I do not recollect particular cases; but if the rules and the declarations of the Commissioners be of any value, the children must have been excluded.

27351. Now, was it not acknowledged by the action of the managers, and sanctioned by the Commissioners, that the meaning of the rule was as I have indicated?—If the Commissioners permitted the children of one religious denomination to receive religious instruction from ministers of a different denomination, I think they were violating faith with the public, and I think that is one of the great grounds on which Catholics impugn the system now.

27352. Will you allow me to read the testimony of Dr. Henry with regard to himself and Archbishop Murray and Mr. Blake? In answer to this question—

"In the point now clearly ascertained, and in what way, that under no circumstances is it the duty of the teacher to see that the children whose parents object quit the school when religious instruction is going on not in accordance with their own persuasion?"

He says—

"I have already stated that the Archbishop of Dublin and Mr. Blake always asserted that the Board never intended to compel any parent to put the children away from the religious instruction."

And he adds, in answer to another question, namely—

"Has that ever received an authoritative interpretation?—I think from the rule I have read the non-obligation is clearly implied. I have heard the late Dr. Murray say he could not be a priest, and I could not be a priest to requiring the attendance of any child from religious instruction. It is the parent's right to withdraw his child, and the cost is thrown upon him of doing so."

Well, it is quite plain that Dr. Henry thought—I believe the Presbyterians in the North generally think—that if they can induce Catholic children without force to attend, they may give them religious instruction. In my opinion, that is a very great breach of faith with the Catholic body, and I think if I had known that statement of Dr. Henry I should have put it forward yesterday or the day before as a proof of the great dangers of the system. I am very thankful to you for having put it in my way.

27353. Then, may I ask have you any reason to doubt the truthfulness of Dr. Henry's testimony?—Not the least. I think he is a very honest man, as

Feb. 25, 1869.

His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

for as I hear of him. I see he tells the truth, though it is very injurious to himself.

27354. Then your predecessor, Archbishop Murray, agreed in opinion with Dr. Henry?—So Dr. Henry says; but I am sure Dr. Murray would not allow Catholic children to receive religious instructions from Protestants.

27355. Your Eminence referred on yesterday, I think, to convent schools. You highly approve of the education of convent schools?—Most highly. I should like to see as many convents as possible scattered through all Ireland, and I hope you will soon have a great many of them in Belfast and other parts of the North.

27356. Well, you are prepared to admit that they have few in Belfast, or in many parts of the North, just now?—Well, in proportion to the other provinces, the convents are few in the North. In Belfast there is at least one convent with several schools, and they are building another.

27357. May I ask when the first convent was established in Belfast?—Very lately.

27358. You gave an opinion then as to the superiority of convent schools to all others under the Commissioners of National Education?—I did not say superiority. I said they were very excellent schools. Very probably there are other excellent schools also under lay teachers, but speaking in general, the convent schools are excellent, and I dare say also they are superior, as a whole, to other schools. They give a very good secular education to the children who frequent their schools; they teach them habits of cleanliness, and they watch over them and endeavour to provide situations or places for them; and what is better than all they teach them, by word and example, to be practically useful in this world, and at the same time, to prepare for eternity. In National schools under Protestant management, the Catholic children learn very little about the practices or duties of good Christians, so necessary for them and others.

27359. Now, up to 1861 were there many convents in the province of Ulster?—I introduced one myself in that very year into Armagh.

27360. Was that the first in the province of Ulster?—No, I think that was the third in the province of Ulster; convents in Newry and Derry had been previously established.

27361. Can you say how many were there in Cavanagh up to that time?—There must have been a great many in Cavanagh. I do not know how many. As to the convent in Armagh, I think it is one of the best teaching bodies in all Ireland. It is a house of ladies of the Sacred Heart. They give an admirable education to ladies of the higher class, and they are most excellent teachers of the poor.

27362. Can your opinion, with regard to their superiority and excellence, be fairly maintained in the face of the Census Commissioners' Report, which shows that in Ulster the proportion per cent of females who could read and write in 1851 was 12, and in 1861 34, that is an absolute increase of 15 per cent., while in Cavanagh the proportions were 9 and 21, showing an increase of only 12 per cent.?—I am not much guided by statistical reports, unless they be most closely analyzed. You can draw almost any conclusion you like from statistics when they are well manipulated, so I should like to see all the little details of the statistics before I would form anything upon them. Then there is a great difference between the province of Ulster and the province of Cavanagh. Ulster has the linen trade, which gives it a great advantage over the province of Cavanagh, where they have no manufacture or trade.

27363. The same remark would apply, I presume, to the statistics of all societies and of all Boards?—They must be very well examined. I see statistical oftentimes brought forward by opposing parties to prove contradictory statements.

27364. Has not almost all the female education in Galway been in the hands of the nuns for thirty

years?—I cannot say that. I know that there are three convents in it at present, all having excellent schools. 27365. When you hear that Galway contained in 1841 only 26 per cent. who could read and write, and in 1861 only 31 per cent., an increase of only 5, whereas in Carrickfergus, where there were no such religious, there was an increase of 21, the numbers being 34 and 55 per cent. respectively, do you still adhere to your opinion?—My opinion is that if you and I went down and examined the children of the convent schools of Galway we should find them much better educated than the children in Carrickfergus.

27366. I wish to put a question or two to your Eminence with regard to mixed education. Is it your opinion that the Roman Catholics of Ireland would approve of a separate or denominational system with separate grants?—I do not think the Roman Catholics of Ireland are asking for separate grants. The Government can make a common grant to Catholics and Protestants, and let that grant be given in proportion to the population, and to the schools. That is, I think, what the Catholic bishops propose in their letter to Mr. Cardwell.

27367. But virtually would not that be a system of separate grants?—No, it would be one grant to one Board, and administered then in favour of the different denominations.

27368. Divided denominationally, do you recollect the fact that Deas Meyer, one of the dignitaries of your Church, was quite opposed to such a system?—I do not attach much importance to his opinions.

27369. He was a dignitary in the Church?—Many of them may have entertained opinions which I would not approve of.

27370. But was not his opinion entitled to respect?—He was a very respectable man. But I think very respectable men sometimes entertain very false opinions.

27371. And did not Archbishop Murray, who occupied the position you held, as Archbishop at least, in Ireland, entertain the same opinion as Deas Meyer?—Dr. Murray looked on the National Board as an experiment, and wished to give it a fair trial, but I think he never decidedly approved it.

27372. And is it not the fact that he enjoyed the confidence of, and that his opinion was respected by, the Roman Catholic laity of the country?—Oh, he was a very venerable man; but many Roman Catholics, both clergy and laity were opposed to him in regard to education; and, probably, had he lived to see the present development of the National system, he would have ceased to be an adherent of it himself.

27373. Are you aware that many of them did?—Sir Thomas Roddigan, for instance, who was a Roman Catholic?—Sir Thomas Roddigan, I dare say, went away on a great many points.

27374. Was he not in favour of mixed education?—He appears to have been favourable to mixed education, but I think he was very wrong.

27375. Was he not representative Roman Catholic?—He was Member of Parliament I believe for Dundalk, but he was not a representative either of the doctrines or opinions of Catholics. He was merely a Member of Parliament.

27376. In the education of the people is it not reasonable that the opinions of the people should be respected as well as the opinions of the clergy?—That is what we are most anxious for. I have proved that priest and people are favourable to the denominational system. The adoption of that system will satisfy both classes.

27377. The present Primrose, I think, of 1868 Church gave evidence before the Commission in 1851?—I heard so. I do not think I have ever read his evidence.

27378. Was he not strongly in favour of the present mixed system of education?—I am not aware. I know he is very strongly against it at present.

27379. In 1854, as a matter of fact, are you not aware that he declared his thorough opposition to the system?—I have not read his evidence; perhaps he declared himself in favour of it, because in his parish

the education of Catholics was under his control, and the schools virtually denationalised.

27389. Allow me to read his testimony—volume 2, page 863—

“Under the united system they have not an opportunity, I am aware, of giving religious education in the form, and at the time that they would wish to give it in the National schools, but it occurs to me that the separate system would entail a still more startling consequence, and a still greater grievance, because under the separate system their children might be obliged to receive a religious education which their parents and masters would greatly disapprove of. Under the present system the moment of the evil is, that they are not afforded an opportunity of giving religious instruction at the time and in the manner that they wish to give it, in the other case there would be a positive violation of the liberty of conscience, instead of the existence only of a want which can be supplied at another time and at another place, so that on the whole I think it would be a great evil to disturb the National system as now existing.”

Probably the separate system referred to was that of privately-taught schools such as those of the Irish Church Jesuits, which all Catholics condemn. But, however, that may be, Dr. Kirwan is a most distinguished and learned man, and I am sure if you ask him he will explain the reasons why he changed his opinion, if he ever held what you attribute to him, and joined the other bishops in asking for denationalised education.

27391. Are you aware that he gave his opinion as to the views of the Catholic laity in those words—“As far as I know their opinions, I think they would be decidedly opposed to any change in the present system, it has worked well.”—Well, I think he has changed his opinion since, and I am sure that, being a very distinguished and learned man, he would be able to give a very good account of the reasons why he changed. I demonstrated the other day to show that Catholics had good grounds for changing their views in favour of the National Board—persons for changing on the part of Catholics, and I proved that at present both Catholic laity and clergy are in favour of denationalised education.

27392. Is a principle of your church that religious and secular instruction should go on *pari passu*?—I do not understand what you mean by a principle of the church.

27393. Is it a dogma—I do not refer to religious dogma, but do you teach it as a matter of principle that religious and secular instruction should go on together?—It is a matter agreed on as a time principle among the Catholic bishops united with the head of the Church, that religious and education should be united. They are on that ground opposed to mixed education. All the Catholic bishops of the world, I may say, have united in expressing their condemnation of mixed education, and all, I think, without exception, declare that religion and education should be united.

27394. Is it a principle of your church that religious and secular education must go together—that secular education should be permeated and interwoven with religious instruction?—It is the general teaching of the Catholic Church that religion ought to permeate all secular teaching, and to permeate every branch of it. If you look to the epistles of St. Paul you will find that he says, “Whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, we should do all for the honour and glory of God,” and in the same way children, learning their A B C, should do so for the honour and glory of God: in that way religion should permeate every action of human life.

27395. Is that which I have stated a principle with you from which there can be no departure?—Where there is no such thing as a Catholic school, those who wish to learn must go to some other sort of school. Necessity may compel them to do so, but they are obliged to procure religious instruction in some other way. This is essential for every Christian.

27396. Could you be induced in connexion with any modification of the present system of education in this country, to separate between secular and religious instruction?—I think it would be very injurious to the country if we did so.

27387. Are you aware that Dr. Kirwan, the present Archbishop and Primate of Ireland of your Church, saw no objection to separating distinctly between secular and religious instruction, and declared that he saw no objection to the restoration of the Board in that matter?—Well, as I stated before, he will be able to explain his change upon the matter. I am sure he is a man who is most desirous for religious Catholic education. He may have spoken in reference to certain schools with which he was acquainted in his own parish. Would you be so kind as to let me know the year of that communication?

27388. 1854; the following question was put to him—

“Entertaining the opinion that you do of the advantages of the convent schools to the lower classes in Ireland, and the confidence which their connexion with the National system inspires in the minds of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity, do you object to any of the restrictions which are now imposed by the Board with regard to religious instruction being given at particular times and as to all persons or any act of public worship being reserved to the time of religious instruction?”

and his answer is

“I do not.”

Allow me to put the same question to you for your answer?—I say if I were living in Donifolia as a parish priest I might make concessions which could produce no evil results. There was a very excellent convent in that town attended by Catholics, a religious instruction was given in it was quite irrefragable, and the nuns took very good care to have the children properly educated in their religion. They educated them by word and example. In such circumstances the Most Rev. Dr. Kirwan could not find much evil from admitting some restrictions at certain hours on religious instruction in some schools.

27390. Allow me to put to you a few propositions which I take from “the Encyclical and Syllabus of Condemned Propositions, published by His Holiness Pope Pius the Ninth, and authentic by the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin.” The propositions are these—

“The entire government of public schools in which the youth of any Christian state is educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and ought to appertain to the civil power and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognised as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approval of the teachers.”

Again—

“The best theory of civil society requires that popular schools open to the children of every class of the people, and generally all public institutions intended for instruction in letters and philosophical sciences and for carrying on the education of youth, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, control and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political power at the pleasure of the rulers and according to the standards of the prevalent opinions of the age.”

Lastly—

“Catholics may approve of a system of educating youth unconnected with Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which regards the knowledge of merely natural things and only or at least primarily the ends of earthly social life.”

You condemn these propositions?—The Pope condemns them and I condemn whatever he condemns. I may add that all the evidence I have given shows that I heartily condemn these propositions.

27390. May I ask you is it open conscientious grounds?—On religious grounds, in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Pope, as Vicar of Christ, condemns those doctrines, and the sheep of the fold listen with submission to his voice.

27391. Do you maintain that you have a conscientious right in the matter of education, which others are bound to respect, whether they think you claim reasonable or not?—I maintain that all bishops have a divine right of teaching all matters referring to faith and morals given to them in the person of the

Feb. 28, 1852

His Reverence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

Apologies by our Divine Lord when he said, "Go ye, teach all nations."

27392. Now there are three other condemned propositions which I wish to read to your Eminence:

"In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship."

Cardinal Cullen—I am afraid that has nothing to do with primary education.

Rev. Dr. Walsh—Again—

"Hence it has been wisely provided by law in some Catholic countries, that persons entering to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own peculiar worship."

Then the 79th is this—

"Moreover it is false that the civil liberty of every form of worship, and full power given to all of openly and publicly manifesting any opinions whatsoever and thoughts, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to propagate the pest of indifference."

27393. You equally condemn these propositions which approve of civil and religious liberty?—Those propositions I think have nothing at all to do with primary education. But I shall say that I unite with the Pope, in condemning them in the sense in which he condemns them; and I add at the same time that his Holiness does not condemn either civil or religious liberty when those words are properly explained, but merely the abuse of civil and religious liberty. The Pope speaks of abstract general doctrines; he does not refer to particular cases. I will just add for explanation, that if all were Catholics in any country as in Italy, it would be unwise to introduce an element of discord, and to proclaim that persons of other religions might come there and establish churches for themselves. This is the case the Pope refers to. He does not refer to the particular cases of other countries in which a variety of religions is established, and persons professing various doctrines live under the same government and enjoy the same rights. That matter, however, has nothing to do with our question, I think, of education.

27394. You say you have this conscientious right which others are bound to respect in regard to the condemnation of civil and religious liberty, and in reference to freedom of worship?—I do not think there is any condemning of civil liberty or toleration in particular cases at all. It is an abstract proposition, laying down a general doctrine which is false in some cases, and is condemned.

27395. Do you expect a State or Government enjoying civil and religious liberty to abandon its principle or position because of the Church's dogma, or "the conscientious right" which the bishops claim?—If you will allow me I will explain it. A prince believes that the Catholic religion is the only true religion. There are none but Catholics in the region, of which he is the head. Strangers wish to come in and change the religion of the people, and he says that he will not allow them, that there is no true religion but the one which he professes, and in order to avoid discord he will not allow strangers of a different religion to establish churches there. The proposition referred to condemns his conduct, and is therefore condemned. But if the same prince found that in his states various religions were enjoying the rights of citizens, he would not interfere with them, and his mode of acting would not be condemned by the Church.

27396. But do you condemn it as a principle that they should be entitled to liberty of worship?—Under the circumstances I referred to where the introduction of a new and false religion would cause discord. But where several different religions already exist, the question is not the same. Thus, for example, the Jews have their public worship in Rome. They have their synagogues; and almost every stranger goes there to have the pleasure of hearing them sing their strange music. So there is no such thing in the words of the Pope as a general condemnation of the principle of toleration in countries where a mixture of religions

already exists, otherwise the Pope would condemn himself.

27397. I am just about to close with a question on another matter. Mr. Keenan was before us as a witness. Your Eminence furnished his name to the Commission as the witness you wished us to examine?—I did. I think he knows the statistics and the general bearing of the National system very well.

27398. Are you aware that he made a visit to the North of Ireland to see as to the working on the violation of the new religious rule?—So he told me, he told me when he came back, and before he set out he told me that he was going.

27399. Can you say whether he was an agent of your Eminence or of the bishops or of any parties in that position?—I cannot say that he was my agent. He never asked permission or authorisation from me. He acted on his own account.

27400. Then if pressed on us as an instrument to examine him upon the subject that he had been sent out, we are to attack his importance to the State itself?—The truth is that he never asked to be my agent, or the agent of any other bishop, as far as I know.

27401. Master Ansell—Your Eminence has given us very strong reasons for the denominational system according to the plan you propose. I am anxious to bring before your mind some difficulties—at least one very great difficulty that occurs to me. I wish first to ask has your Eminence read the text of the reading books of the Christian Brothers?—I have read some of them, there are some I have not read, and I could scarcely find time to read all such books.

27402. Have you read the History of Ireland?—I have read a portion of it.

27403. How is the Government to guard against the extreme hostility to England and to Englishmen that is inculcated in almost every page of that book?—I don't think that hostility is inculcated in it. Facts are stated certainly not creditable to the English Government, and penal laws are recorded; all this must be done, unless you condemn us to ignore the history of our country. At the same time I think there is great respect manifested in the schools of the Christian Brothers for the Government, and I read yesterday a document sent signed by the Superior-General in all his schools, inculcating due obedience to the higher powers.

27404. I have not forgotten it; it struck me very much?—That shows that the Brothers inculcate a respect for their rulers, who are generally Englishmen; moreover, they inculcate Christian charity towards all men.

27405. I wish, then, to call your attention, just to justify my own apprehension, a little more closely to this History of Ireland. From the invasion of Strongbow down to the year 1829—that is six centuries and a half—there are fifty-four pages. Now, of those, thirty are filled with the most horrible details of cruelty, perfidy, and oppression against the Irish, all perpetrated by English people. They are called "treacherous foreigners," who thought it meritorious to persecute and oppress, they are charged with spoliation, rapine, and murder in every second page—"the sword was lifted for three centuries"—"three centuries of a rule in Ireland of fire and sword." Instances such as this—

"It was a cruel thing to beat with stones the shorn heads of their clergy, till their heads pushed out. Others had needles thrust into the irons, or the nails themselves were torn off. Many were crucified upon the rack or pressed under weights, others had their hands torn open, which they were obliged to support with their hands, or their flesh torn with iron rods."

What year does that refer to?

27406. It was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. These I have already mentioned are only a few of many, for they occur in every second page—a declaration of James the First, that no toleration would ever be granted by him, foul conspiracies against the Irish; and of the six or seven pages which contain the reign of the Georges, one entire page taken up with

account of a most detestable judicial murder, if the facts are truly reported, of a most innocent and meritorious druggist. Now with these pressed upon the attention of boys of eleven and twelve, and thirteen years of age, how can they be otherwise than hateful of indignation and hatred against the action that are represented here as a people that have no sentiment but cruelty and love of oppression. Can there be a more thorough training for Fenianism than to inculcate that sort of thing into the minds of boys?—

The answer is clear, that it is very unfortunate that those facts are true—also, too true. The facts referred to are mentioned in official despatches, and in Acts of Parliament. If children do not learn them under teachers capable of showing that no amount of wrong will justify as to hating those who injure us, they will learn them from editors of newspapers, or writers who record them for salacious purposes. Charity obliges us to forgive injuries, but it does not call on us to forget them. Without a knowledge of past grievances, our present condition would be unexplainable. Truth must be told in history. I tend in some public document, lately published, that in Queen Elizabeth's reign the Catholic bishop of Cusack, Dr. O'Healey, was brought up here, and that his feet were put into tin boots filled with tar and grease, and were boiled upon a scolding fire. It also appears that the same piece was put on the head of a priest as on that of a wolf. Facts like these, unfortunately, cannot be denied, and it would be absurd to try to conceal facts recorded in the most public documents; it would be a very strange thing, if of the conversion of Constantine, or after that time, Christians were required to forget all that they had suffered under the Roman Empire for three centuries. If such things were required, history would cease to be what it ought to be, *factis veritate*.

But to come to the Christian Brothers, whilst they teach the facts of history as they occurred, they inculcate most carefully an attachment to the Catholic faith, and they show that the faith which produced men so constant in their religious profession must be the true faith. Now, our faith inculcates that charity towards all men must be maintained, and that respect is due to the established Government. Thus being the case, when children see the necessity of faith, and admit that charity must be maintained, and that they are bound to obey their legitimate superiors, they will be faithful subjects; and thus was confined, during the late rebellion in the country, when the religious teaching referred to produced the best effects. The Christian Brothers always inculcate the necessity of faith, and to show its value they refer to the fact that our forefathers suffered and died in cruel tortures rather than renounce it. Faith, being thus strengthened, works by charity, and tends to preserve a spirit of submission and obedience to the people. However, it is to be regretted that outrages were committed in Ireland in past times by all parties. This is always the case in civil wars, and we cannot forget that domestic fury was increased by attempts to introduce a new religion by confiscation and penal laws.

27407. They see that in the very point which I was coming to. There is not a word about any cruelties committed by the Irish. In this history there are but two general expressions, that they were drunken, violent, rebellious characters, but generally speaking they are painted as an innocent suffering race, most anxious for justice, which is always denied, and every misdeed is "alleged by" any exaggerating writer is brought forward to stir up their feelings against the English nation. Well, it is proved, unfortunately, that the Irish were the suffering people. When Strongbow came over he confiscated nearly half the province. In progress of time all the north was confiscated, in the reign of James the First. Under Charles the First there was a project for confiscating Connaught, by Strafford, who was called off to England and beheaded himself before he could execute his project. Then, when Cromwell, there was what was called the transplantation to Connaught. Poor people of eighty years of age were taken and sent off there in the midst of

winter. Under William the Third new confiscations were carried out, and under Queen Anne most cruel penal laws affecting poverty, education, paternal authority, and liberty of religion, were enforced. These are facts that cannot be ignored in the history of a country, and they are facts which, when properly related, do not really excite the people to anything else but a love of their faith, and whilst they keep their faith, there is no fear of their becoming disloyal subjects.

27408. How has the love of faith anything to do with the bloody cruelties of the 300 years before Henry the Eighth?—It has little to do with them, because the people were then fighting for liberty, and they were still not conquered, and they were fighting like one independent State against another. Cruelties were committed, but not to be compared with those of later days. After the time of Queen Elizabeth it was a fight for religion.

27409. Even your historian Moore, in a passage quoted in this very book, commencing with the reign of Henry the Eighth, says—

"The period of Anglo-Irish history, upon the borders of which we have arrived, may safely be limited on both by the histories and its modern, since that one century is its essence, without losing much that either the pen or the memory can find any resemblance to figure upon its record."

Why is that rule reversed in this case so as to give the most minute account of every cruelty?—Moore I suppose wished to have something pleasant to talk about.

He was a very jovial man, and he did not like to treat of unpleasant subjects, still in his misdeeds and elsewhere, he often treats of the wrongs and sufferings of Ireland.

27410. I want to know the practical benefit of telling all those savage stories to boys—a number of stories which, so far as they are true, all English persons disprove, acknowledge, lament, and repent of, and are anxious now to obliterate them if possible by present kindness and compensation, as far as possible—why is it kept up?—The statement you make supplies an answer to your question. Is it not a very great advantage that the children should know that the English are so much better affected towards Ireland now than they were in former times? Former kings and a former queen persecuted the Irish, confiscated their property and treated them most barbarously. Now, under the present Queen, we enjoy the greatest protection. Now we see that the people of England are most anxious to protect our interests, and that Parliament is doing away every day with the penal laws that exist. As legends cruelties mentioned in history, I think if you will turn over the sacred volume you will find greater cruelties than were ever perpetrated in Irish history, and still divinely inspired writers thought fit to mention them.

27411. I find this book re-published in 1805, and that the proposed compensation you mentioned mentions as nowhere hinted at. It is nowhere said that "these are the English of old times, not now, we are come in for a better generation?"—This shows the necessity of learning under a good master. The Christian Brothers are very good men, and they inculcate everything religious on the minds of the children. When those terrible facts come before them they will say to them, "the ascriptions of these facts has nothing to do with the Government of the present day." An illustration to this effect is given in the preface to the history in question, p. 4.—

"It may be well to remark here, 'that the crimes of our ancestors are recorded for our instruction, and should be avoided, not imitated; that the present generation is not answerable for the crimes and follies of those which have preceded; and that it would be desirable if the use of the evils resulting from intemperance and dissipation would lead to the more zealous cultivation of Christian charity—not only the most sublime of virtues, but that which contributes most to the peace, the harmony, and consequently, the happiness and prosperity of a nation.'"

27412. Now may I ask you as a high clerical authority would you approve of a book prepared for Protestant pupils that would bring out—that disgusting detail, all the horrors committed by Sir Philip O'Neill,

Feb 25, 1869  
His Excellency  
Governor  
Cullen.

56. 23. 1869

Sir Erasmus  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

in 1841—who is admitted even in this book to have been a monster of cruelty?—I would bring out all that was true. I think if a man writes history it is necessary to detail the truth: it may be very unpleasant or very disagreeable to relate it, but if you write history you must tell the truth. There is some good or other that will always come out of the truth.

27413. Where is there anything of that sort in this book—for though Sir Philip O'Neill is stated to have been very cruel we read nothing of the hangings and beatings with clubs, and all the other cruelties whatever they may have been?—It is not at all certain that he committed such cruelties.

27414. It is admitted here?—He may have been a cruel man, but he never expressed such cruelties as were perpetrated by the public authorities. The principal charge against him is that he maltreated the Scotch, but before he maltreated them he gave them notice that if they would not take up arms against him, they should not be molested. I must add, that at p. 568 it is stated, that Owen Roe O'Neill denounced, in the strongest language, the excesses which his lieutenant, Sir Philip, had committed. An Owen Roe O'Neill is praised as a most distinguished man, the children would learn from his example to reprobate the excesses referred to.

27415. Now, if the Government of England should differ from your Eminence, and consider this a very undesirable book, and the most direct means for Protestantism, what control would they under your system have, or what power of correcting that?—Let the Commissioners of Education communicate with those who drew up that book and tell them they objected to those passages, and ask them to correct any misstatements found in it.

27416. But who is to inform them of this?—Cannot the Commissioners, take the book and look over it themselves, or depute somebody else to do so?

27417. But according to your plan—and that is the point I wish to press upon you—you say that there ought to be denominational inspectors. Now if there be denominational inspectors, there is the less likelihood that they would complain of denizens and persons of their own faith?—If there be anything existing to rebellion or disloyalty, I think Catholic inspectors would be the very first to denounce it. The Catholics are very faithful to established governments and they showed that effectually, they fought for Charles the First; they fought again for James the Second, when the revolution took place in England, and drove him out of it; whatever situation is granted to them, they fall in and march most faithfully; so that you cannot charge the Catholics at all with any tendency to disaffection.

27418. But I think it very likely that they would have a tenderness towards their co-religionists—and now it appears that your Eminence and the other Catholic bishops had this work before them constantly, and it never occurred to them to blame the Christian Brothers?—My opinion is, that it has not produced the least effect in promoting disaffection; and that I prove from the fact that, during the whole time of the Fenian agitation, there was scarcely a single Fenian among all those poor boys that learned that history.

27419. That is a strong thing to say?—There may have been one—I recollect three who were charged with disaffection—but three was nothing like a spread of Fenianism amongst the Christian Brothers' pupils, and if you take any of the boys and ask him "are you obliged to be subject to the Government?" he will quote from the Catholic catechism the passage of St. Paul: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers" (Rom. xiii.).

27420. I want to know in regard to the Inspectors, what is the difficulty of having Inspectors appointed by the Government, not confining them to a particular religion—that is, considering that according to your view the governing body, the State, should have nothing to do with the religious education of training, but simply have it in view to give and ensure a good

secular education—in that point of view, why should there not be Government Inspectors elected by the Government itself?—It would be very inconvenient to have Protestant Inspectors for Catholic schools, Protestants do not always understand the little details and little practices of Catholics, and they might imagine that there was something strange going on in a school, when there would be really nothing wrong. I heard of an instance of this kind lately. Protestants, even when well-informed, often misinterpret things which are quite intelligible to Catholics, and which contain nothing but what is good in them, and on account reports disseminating to a school might be made to the Board by Inspectors, without any foundation. There is another reason. The very fact of having an Inspector of a different religion would excite a little excitement amongst the children, and would bring about religious observations, and perhaps religious controversies, which it is better they should all avoid. Some children would ask could an Catholic Inspector be found fit to visit a Catholic school, others would add that there were very good Catholic Inspectors to be found, and that it was unfair to exclude them. It is better that the whole teaching, from beginning to end, should be homogeneous—Protestant for Protestant children, and Catholic for Catholic children.

27421. I have asked several of the Inspectors here of the National Board, both Protestant and Catholic, as to whether they found any inconvenience even to arise from their inspection in schools of a different faith, and, without a single exception, they have all answered in the negative—I never heard of any objection?—Probably the Inspectors would be the last to hear what was said about themselves, and it is not probable that they would be anxious to make charges against their own class. *Nemo judex in causa propria*. Thus if difficulties have not arisen already, they may spring up any day. Years might pass by before you would have serious objections, but still they might spring up.

27422. Then that is the entire amount of the difficulty in your mind with regard to an occasional Protestant Inspector?—A Protestant might wish to ask questions, too, without wishing to offend Catholic children, which at the same time would be displeasing to Catholics and harmful to them. Any little occasional cases might give rise to a question which would be very mischievous in the eyes of Catholics. Besides, as in England, there are Catholic Inspectors for Catholic schools. Why should we be denied the same privilege in Ireland?

27423. Then the fact of an Inspector being a Protestant would be in your mind, I understand, a decided objection to his being a proper Inspector of your schools?—My desire would be that each class should have its own inspectors. I suppose there are some very excellent men among Protestants who would not interfere in any matter with the conduct of the school, or with the religion of the children, but there might be some men who would give assistance on that head. You know there is a great deal of excitement at present among religious masters in Ireland. I dare say you have read—I have myself—some of the speeches delivered at the Rotunda about the month of April or May last year, a great deal of prejudice against Catholics was there manifested by very respectable men. So an Inspector might be of that class, a respectable man with very deep prejudices.

27424. But one would think that thirty-five years' experience of the practice of the Board on that subject ought to be an assurance that no collision of the sort or no disagreeable result would follow?—I do not doubt that there may have been occasionally disagreeable occurrences, of which mention may not have been made. I will mention a case to illustrate how easily mischief may be done. There was a Protestant mistress over Catholic children in a country school, every day when the Catholic children came to school, if any of them had dirty hands, she would say to them "Do your parents teach you to keep dirty hands?" Then if any child told a lie, "Does your parent teach



you to tell him if any children was idle, "Does your priest teach you to be idle?" Well, all such things are very offensive and very injurious to the children; and so that account I should wish to have all danger of their occurring removed from the schools.

27425 But I am speaking of educated men and gentlemen?—Well, you will see the most educated men in Ireland making most violent speeches against Catholicism in Dublin at the May meetings, speeches sometimes full of the most absurd charges and assertions. I would not like that such respectable men should be inspectors over Catholic schools. I generally buy the papers to have the pleasure of laughing at them every April or every May.

27426 Only one point more. You seem to be opposed to requiring certificates of competency from teachers. May I ask why that is?—I am very much for maintaining any liberty that can be allowed to the subject. Give as much liberty as possible; let every one try to be a schoolmaster if he can. If then the inspector finds that he is not capable of teaching let him report him, and let the Board withdraw his salary.

27427 In the meantime, months, and perhaps years, my slaves of inefficient teaching!—So it happens in the present system, though they have an examination, still there are teachers employed that are very incapable of teaching; and besides, probationary teachers sometimes are engaged for months before they are examined.

27428 There are two things required—knowledge, and the faculty of teaching.—You must add religious beliefs, and exemplary conduct.

27429 But with regard to what can be known independent of the power of teaching—the faculty of teaching can only be known by experiment, but surely knowledge.—I—Well, when that is known by experience, I would not require an examination.

27430 But in the meantime the children suffer?—But they suffer at present when they get a bad master, and also when they are placed under an unfit probationary teacher. Such things cannot be always avoided.

27431 But you take away half the amount of wages if you choose that the man is sufficiently well informed?—In my opinion where you admit free trade you ought also to admit free education. The people are very good judges where their own interests or those of their children are concerned. Probably you will have better education in the country by leaving it free, and you won't incur so much expense. I look to money and I look to freedom of education.

As to me, my lord, propose any new matter, allow me to observe that there was a question between myself and Judge Morris last evening about a passage in Burke. I have brought Burke's work with me, so that the passage may be verified. It is taken from a letter of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke to the Rev. Dr. Tinsley, dated March, 17th, 1795. Speaking about Catholic colleges, Burke says that he would allow nothing to the Government but the right of suspending the accounts. And then he continues—

"All other interference whatever, if I were in the place of these interested persons, I would resist, and would seek rather to let God's good providence, and the contributions of your own people, for the education of your clergy, thus to put into the hands of your laity, as well, and unobjectionable means—into the hands of those who make it their next and their heart that they are your enemies, the very enemies of your souls and your religion. I have considered this matter at large and at various times, and I have considered it in relation to the designs of your enemies: the release of those told you, as you well know, did not originate from there, but they will endeavour to pervert the benevolence and liberality of others into an instrument of their own evil purposes. Be well assured that they never did and that they never will, consent to give one shilling of money for any other purpose than to do you mischief. If you consent to put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction or control, then you will have added your religion for their money. There will be an end not only of the Catholic religion, but of all religion, all morality, all law, all order in the whole kingdom."

Those are the words of Burke. It is quite clear that he puts clerical education in opposition to every other sort of education. I think there was a mistake in the passage as quoted by Judge Morris; for the proposition had down by Burke is as clear as it can possibly be expressed.

27432 Rev. Dr. IFWILL.—Is it not plain that the distinction in the mind of Mr. Burke is as between what is more peculiarly clerical education—that is, for the priesthood, referring to authority, and so on, and the literary education of the same persons?—It is quite clear that he means to contrast the clerical education with the education of the laity. The bad effect he says of government interference would reach both clergy and laity, and destroy all morality in both.

27433 That is the secular education of the priesthood?—Oh, no, the clerical education of the priesthood includes education in secular matters and education in religious matters. That is called clerical education. Students going into Maynooth read a year of humanity and a year of rhetoric, in which they learn nothing but the classics, Latin and Greek, and the elements of mathematics. Afterwards they learn theology. The whole course constitutes the clerical education of the students.

27434 Is it not plain that the whole passage bears upon Maynooth and the education there, and that the distinction is as between the professional training as a whole for the priesthood, and what is merely literary and scientific?—Oh, not at all. Burke speaks about several colleges which the bishops were anxious at that time to institute, and not specially about Maynooth. These were to serve both for clergy and laity. There were lay students in Maynooth for several years after its foundation. Clerical education comprises both secular and theological education, and this clerical education is opposed to "lay education or any other part of education," so that Burke exhorts the Catholics to keep both clerical and secular, and every part of education free from Government control.

27435 Rev. Mr. COOKE.—There are two or three things about which I wanted to ask your Eminence. Do you object to the teachers being certificated of necessity?—Well, you know that is not a question of religion, that is a question of practical economy or practical policy. In my opinion I think it is not necessary to have them certificated; they can go on very well without certificates; but that is an opinion of my own.

27436 Would you approve of a system of payment by results, as in England?—I think it would be very good to have payment by results in the greater part of the country where there are good large schools; but in some parts where the people are very poor, and the schools badly attended, it would be hard to pay the master by that standard, because you cannot expect great results in a very poor part of the country or in a very poor school.

27437 In that case, if the teacher is to be paid a fixed salary, ought he not to show in some way or other that he is competent to teach a school?—The children ought to be examined, and the teacher ought to be called to account if they are not properly trained. In Dublin there could be payment by results, because there is a population to supply large schools, and the children can attend, at least a large number can attend, and receive proper instruction.

27438 Lord CARDINAL.—Does your Eminence think that the payment by results might form in the country parts a supplement to the fixed salary?—I think any arrangement that might be made upon that head has no bearing upon religion, and I have been endeavouring to keep to the religious side of the question as closely as possible. However, this is a matter I think of necessity, and it would be well that the most economical way should be adopted, having regard at the same time to the way best calculated to promote progress in study. A master who has to account for results, and to show that his children are gaining some benefit from his lectures, would be more atten-

Feb. 24, 1883.  
His Honour  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

tive to his duty, and the parish priest, or whoever may be manager of the school, would be likewise more anxious to have a good attendance of children, and to create a greater desire for study. I think some consideration of the results would be very useful.

27439 *Rev. Mr. Connell*.—Do I understand your Eminence to mean that, that provided your school are secured the full teaching of the religion of the children, the financial details by which the system should be worked out, would not be a matter of so much importance to you?—What we look to principally is to have a full and free religious education given to children, and that besides they should get a good secular education. As to finance, if you will allow me, I will read a paragraph from a letter of the Irish bishops to show what their views are upon that subject. The paragraph is from a letter addressed to Mr. Cardwell in 1880—

"*The Separate System not opposed to the proper management of the Public Schools*—We now come to the third question, that we are anxious for the separate system with the view of securing to ourselves the management of the funds allotted to educational purposes. The Protestant Bishops of Ireland, Lord G. Russell, is a published letter, says that the Catholic Bishops have been asking 'for separate grants of money from the State for the purpose of maintaining schools under the exclusive control of the priests of the two churches'; and the Protestants in their General Assembly, deprecate the proposal made by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of a separate grant, under their own irresponsible control. These charges do not require to be refuted, as our reasonable opponents state that 'we do not entertain any desire to interfere in the management of the proper management of the public funds, nor wish the civil Government should exercise control.' But it is necessary to refer to an observation in your letter which seems to bear upon this subject.

"In the fourth paragraph you say, 'Parliament assigns a pecuniary aid to the purpose of National education, and as this aid is drawn from taxes contributed by all, it is deemed fit in an object in which all are equally concerned.' If these words mean that no funds derived from the public treasury can be applied to schools in which any particular religious tenets are inculcated with a bias, we cannot admit their accuracy. The money contained in them is this same as it would be with the example of England and the colonies where not only Protestant, but also exclusively Catholic schools receive aid from the same treasury, without exposing the State to the charge of partiality or injustice. But if the meaning of the passage be, that all those who contribute to the taxes have a right to share in the advantages derived from them, we readily agree in so far as principle, a system that not only Catholics, but all other religious denominations may claim to participate in the educational efforts of the State, the several classes receiving instruction according to their respective means and their numbers; not for the purpose of establishing proselytising schools, but to enable them to educate their children in their own religion. No aid ought to be granted to aggression or proselytising schools.

"*One cannot but observe that Education ought to be merely Financial and Impartial*—And here let us ask would it not be wise if Government were to restrict its interference to regard to education to the training of primary schools and to financial arrangements, and to no other, as far as it serves to secure the proper management of the public treasury? A Government consisting of persons professing different and contradictory opinions, and a legislative body in which Tories, Whigs, Liberals, Radicals, Protestants, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics are equally admitted, cannot uniformly offer in favouring the most orthodox and not to be accomplished without introducing special religious doctrines. Whenever the State has taken into its hands public education, and especially in mixed countries, its fitting part is to complete. The example of Prussia is instructive, which, obliged to maintain a system of State education, has begun to restrict its legitimate functions to the Church. The State ought to regulate the progress of every branch of knowledge, and can do so effectively by reviewing and preparing work for printing, and by supervising examinations, and by watching over the legitimate application of the funds allotted to education, without going further. It ought not to discuss, or governing the functions of the schoolmaster, to settle in the footsteps of the first French Republic, that declared all children to be the property of the State. The functions of the Government, or of any Government Board ought to be merely financial and impartial. If any public Board, especially a mixed one, unduly

take to give religious and moral lessons to the country, as the National Commissioners have done, it intrudes into the domain of religion, outstepping the boundaries of its own legitimate sphere of action, in opposition to the maxim 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.' Matthew xxi. 18."

27440 *May I ask your Eminence if you think that the letter of Mr. Christopher Forster to the Board was at all written after consultation with the Roman Catholic Bishops*—I know I never was consulted, I can answer for myself, and I am not aware that any other bishops were consulted.

27441 *You are aware that it referred very much to the question of training teachers*. Would the provisions proposed by Mr. Forster in that letter, do you think, be acceptable to the Roman Catholic bishops now?—Some of them would, I think, be very acceptable. Mr. Forster's plan allows private individuals and communities to establish training schools on condition that accommodation for twenty pupils should be provided in the institution, and that a National school should be annexed with sixty or eighty scholars in it. These conditions being fulfilled, the Government would pay the expense of the pupils in training. Then the plan would be very acceptable, because it would open the way to have denominational training schools established immediately, and the ordinary schools attached to them would, of course, be equally denominational. Mr. Forster's plan provides also for establishing boarding schools for different denominations in connexion with the model schools or with the model training schools, and giving chaplains to these model schools, leaving the mixed teaching just as it is at them. I think that would not be satisfactory.

27442 *You would not like to undertake any responsibility in connexion with the Marlborough street schools*—I would not. As long as the model system continues I would not allow any Catholic chaplain to act under the Board in connexion with the model school, because the presence of such a chaplain would be an approval of what I said the other bishops condemn.

27443 *May I ask your Eminence another question*. It has been brought forward here as a sample of the divided state of opinion amongst the bishops, that some of them have withdrawn the children from the model schools, and others have not. Now, your Eminence has withdrawn the children at Athy, but has not withdrawn them at Marlborough street. Can you give us any explanation of the reason for your different treatment at the two places?—I think there is a very good reason. In one place you may have parents sufficient for all the children in denominational schools, in another place the case may be different. In Athy, for example, there is a very excellent convent, and there is a school of the Christian Brothers; the town being small, these two institutions are quite sufficient to give a good Catholic education to all the poor children. I think there are between 500 and 600 children in the main school, and about 250 in the Christian Brothers' school, and that is a very good number for such a town as Athy. So they are very well provided for without running the risk of losing their faith or exposing themselves to danger in the model school. Here in Dublin the number of children is so great that the purely Catholic schools are not sufficient for them, and hence it would be a hardship to keep them altogether from model schools. But in a short time the children will have no excuse for frequenting model schools. Every year new schools under religious control are opened, and the Catholic children are gradually going to them in preference to mixed schools. I think in the West Dublin mixed Model School there used to be about 800 children; and now I think they are reduced to about 300. Here, in this vicinity, the Christian Brothers opened a school the other day in Beane street, in St. Paul's parish, and there were 340 children within ten days in it. We are preparing another school just now at Strand street, within a few paces of this, for the Christian Brothers, which will hold 600 children. Another great school to be con-

Feb. 25, 1869,  
His Eminence  
Cardinal  
Cullen.

acted by the same brothers, is about to be opened in the parish of St. James. As soon as these schools shall be in full operation, the Catholic boys of their own accord will leave the model or mixed schools, because they will get elsewhere a good religious education, and generally a better secular education under the Christian Brothers, without any danger to faith.

27444. May I ask—perhaps I ought not to ask—whether your Eminence put the teachers of the model schools here under any religious disability?—We did not put them under any religious disability in Dublin. They were told that mixed education and mixed model schools were dangerous to Catholic faith, but nothing more was done to control them. They were left to act as their own responsibility, and according to the dictates of their conscience.

27445. Were they refused the sacraments?—There was no dismission decree excluding them from sacraments. But if any priest found that they were doing mischief, or acting in a way to injure religion, of course he would refuse them absolution. In some instances the presence of a good master in a model school may prevent evil, and I have heard of one priest who allows Catholics to remain as teachers in a model school, whilst he prohibits Catholic children to frequent it.

27446. Mr. Dean.—I wish to ask your Eminence one question about parental right, arising out of this examination. If you regard the master from a political, as distinguished from a religious point of view, would your Eminence admit the full right of a parent to choose where his own child should be educated?—I have been endeavouring to explain that point several times. If a parent be intimately convinced that his own religion is the true religion, and holds to that religion, and is a practical professor of that religion, he ought to get his child educated in his own religion, and if he do not, he is acting against his conscience, and guilty of a sin. A Catholic is persuaded that his own religion is the true religion, and he is obliged then, in conscience and in duty, to get his child educated in that religion. I suppose if a man has no religion, he will imagine that he is not called on to make his son better than himself.

27447. One the State be expected to recognise any right over the child as to the mode and place of its education except the right of a parent?—The State with us professes to let every parent send his children to any school he selects, of course, parents are bound in conscience to send their children to a proper school. I have said that the State with us professes not to interfere in the selection of schools, but, however, it actually interferes by giving large subsidies to certain schools, and granting premiums for attendance in this way, a great indirect influence is exercised over the choice of parents.

27448. Is not the right that the Church claims of allowing Catholic parents an indirect right exercised, as your Eminence has just put it now, over the conscience of the parent?—It is exercised in the same way as every other right which the Church has to prevent parents from doing anything contrary to conscience. The Church has a right to insist on the observance of the laws of God. If a parent acts contrary to what he acknowledges and believes to be the law of God, he commits a sin, and the Church has a right, or the practice of the Church have a right to prevent the parents, by moral teaching, and by the exercise of their spiritual powers, from committing that sin.

27449. Would a Catholic be permitted habitually to frequent the sacraments of penance and the holy eucharist if he persisted in exposing the morals of his child to serious risk of contamination?—If a person exposes his children to the risk of moral contamination he cannot receive any sacrament. Suppose there was a parent who put his child as an apprentice in an establishment in which great immorality prevailed, and children were taught to blaspheme, and so act improperly in every way, and if the parent, knowing that, refused to keep his child as an apprentice there, the father would be obliged to warn him of the guilt he

was incurring in doing so, and refuse him absolution if he continued to leave the child exposed to perdition.

27450. Would his offence be, in the eyes of the Church, of a similar nature to that of the Catholic who willfully persisted in exposing his child to the danger of weakening, and perhaps losing his faith?—The parent who puts his child in a place where he cannot avoid contracting immoral habits, is guilty of a great offence in the eyes of God and the Church. The parent who exposes his child to the danger of losing faith, without which it is impossible to please God, is guilty in the same way. In individual cases, of course, there may be circumstances which would increase or diminish the responsibility.

27451. There is another point with regard to the training of teachers. Are not the teachers in ordinary schools—Catholic teachers under Catholic managers—expected generally speaking as a part of their duty, to aid in giving religious instruction?—Yes, they generally teach the Catechism. I think they are always required to do so where the parish priest, or a lay Catholic, is manager.

27452. Would it not be very desirable that teachers, part of whose duty this religious teaching is to be, should have a special instruction for such teaching?—It is of the greatest importance that they should be specially instructed in religion; in other countries the day's work in training schools commences with religious instruction. It is evident that those should be specially religious instruction for the teachers who have to instruct others; but whilst the mixed training schools are kept up, this most important part of education must be neglected.

27453. Is not it in your Eminence's opinion that such training is impossible except in a denominational school?—I think the teachers cannot be properly trained in religion except in a denominational school. They must be trained both in the practice and in the theory of religion—that cannot be done where there is a mixture of teachers and pupils of different religions, and where the practices of one religion cannot be introduced without giving umbrage to the followers of another creed.

27454. Is your Eminence of opinion that it would be desirable that schools under the management of the Christian Brothers should be able to receive aid from State grants for educational purposes?—I think they are very well entitled to every aid. The Brothers are among the best teachers in the country, and I think it is a very great reproach to an enlightened Government to exclude such men—and such deserving men—from any grant from the State, or to adopt any system that would exclude them.

27455. Is your Eminence aware whether the Christian Brothers have an objection, or whether it is contrary to their rule to submit to external inspection?—I suppose they would not have any difficulty in submitting to what I was proposing—inspection in financial and in literary matters. But they would not submit to inspection in anything that would interfere with the internal management of their own community, or with their religious teaching.

27456. But in case they were to object to submit themselves to external inspection in literary matters, could it be expected that a grant would be given to their schools unless the inspectors of the country had that security that the Christian Brothers were giving value for the State grant?—At present, without any inspection, every one knows—the Government and inspectors know—that the Christian Brothers give an excellent education to their pupils. Public opinion is an excellent criterion of the merit or demerit of a school. Hence, without inspection, the character of the Christian Brothers' schools could be very well known. However, I believe they have no objection to inspection of their schools or pupils, or examination in secular matters. But they would have an objection to anything that would interfere with their rules, or with religious teaching, or their system of instruction.

27457. I am not aware whether your Eminence has

Feb. 25, 1852.  
 The Reverend  
 Cardinal  
 Cullen

been asked any question on the subject of compulsory education, but would you object to or be in favour of any legislation that would make education compulsory here, as it is in Prussia?—I object altogether to anything that limits the liberty of the subject, for I think that it does mischief to the country. A passage from Mr. Mill's Philosophy will illustrate what I mean: "It is not," says he, "undoubtedly that a Government should either in law or in fact, have a complete control over the education of the people. To possess such a control and actually to exert it is to be despotic. A Government which can mould the opinions and sentiments of the people from their youth upwards, can do with them whatever it pleases." These are the words of Mr. Mill. It shows that he does not wish the Government to interfere so far as to exercise control or compulsion in regard to education. In Prussia, where they have a compulsory system, the people complain of it as very oppressive in many cases. It would be good in some instances, for example, in regard to the children of beggars and vagrants. If people of that class were compelled to send their children to some school to take them off the road, it would be a great advantage. But, in general, freedom of education ought to be upheld.

27458 Mr. Sullivan.—In case it were deemed necessary to carry out the present system of paying teachers personal salaries—you are aware that personal salary would be determined by their own education, by the standard that they had obtained—does your Eminence think that there would be any objection to apply the rule of examination to all teachers, in case they receive salary whether religious or otherwise?—I think it would not be necessary. I would introduce the law of Canada, which expressly exempts the religious orders, nuns, Christian Brothers, and priests, when they take charge of a school, from examination. But then they should show afterwards by their results that they were good teachers. That is the law of the parliament of Lower Canada, which is mentioned by Mr. Fraser in his report on education.

27459 The case of Canada is not an exact parallel, because here the greater part of the salary is paid as a personal salary to the teacher himself, and is paid according to his attainments. If the test of examination be not applied, and the Christian Brothers refuse to be examined, they can only then demand payment by results; and that would be looked upon as a grievance, would it not?—Well, I think not. The Christian Brothers would be satisfied to be paid by results because their schools are so very well conducted that they would be sure to get a high salary; but I do not think there is any difficulty about paying the community, because one person represents them, and it is no business of the Government whether that money received by one person is divided with others or not, provided the children be well taught.

27460 That would apply to the payment by results—it does not matter to whom it is paid, it is given to the school; but in the payment of direct salary to the teacher for the services of the teacher, it might be paid to the superior, but certainly for the services of an individual teacher?—One individual could be put over the school, if it could not be managed otherwise. One of the brothers could be put over the school, and let him be examined if it be necessary, or if it could not be managed otherwise. But, where the character of the schools is so well established, I do not see any necessity of examining the brothers.

27461 And let him then receive his salary in proportion to his acquirements?—That is what is done in France, and I believe it is done in England.

27462 Would your Eminence extend that to the case of nuns?—Nuns manage their schools very well, and I do not think they require to be examined. It is very inconvenient for them to be going out of their convents to be examined. If it were a mere matter

of examination by writing, I suppose there would not be much difficulty, but I look on it as unnecessary, where the results show that the school is good. I say the same of Christian Brothers.

27463 But that is a matter of detail. I speak rather of the general principle. Would it be fair or otherwise for the nuns who teach to forego the advantage of the personal salary which is given to the lay teachers, when by a simple examination they may be entitled not only to that, but to the actual results of their teaching?—The examination proposed is, indeed, a matter of detail and expediency; and I am persuaded nothing of the kind should be introduced without necessity. However, in France and in other countries nuns submit to the examination. I think such examinations are quite unnecessary when the general results prove that the schools are excellent.

27464 In principle, therefore, your Eminence does not see any difficulty?—I think it is an inconvenient thing to carry out. When you have highly respectable and excellent persons teaching, and when you see such excellent results from their teaching, I would rather exempt them from the examination. I do not think the nuns themselves complain of the way in which they are paid now, but I think it is an unfair way still. I do not think that they get a salary in proportion to their exertions and to their numbers, but I would rather let them remain as they are than call on them to submit to an examination.

27465 Rev Mr. Cullen.—But it is not the fact that the Sisters of Mercy vary very much in their capacity as teachers, some are very good, and some are not so good?—There may be a difference between teachers under every system. I dare say if you go into Trinity College you will find that among the professors, some may be perhaps of the first class, and others inferior. It is the same in every teaching body.

27466 Do not the children in many cases resort to the convent schools on account of the kindness and goodness of the nuns, without much reference to their teaching power?—I think both motives act on the children in regard to convent schools. They are treated with great kindness, but at the same time they are well instructed. Some convent schools are far superior to others in literary matters, but in all of them one great advantage is secured. The children are made to conduct themselves with great propriety, and taught to keep themselves clean, and to be modest about company, to be humble and modest; they are quite different from children running wild without anyone to attend to them. Then there is another consideration with regard to the children, that a great many more of them attend nuns' schools than would attend a lay school, and they attend more diligently. Besides these advantages, the children are always well instructed in religious matters by the nuns, and trained up in practices of prayer, and the exercise of virtues.

27467 Mr. Sullivan.—With regard to the Central Training School, it has been proposed to maintain that school, and to grant boarding-houses for the different religious persuasions. Would the maintenance of that central school in its present form, with those boarding-houses attached, under the care of Catholic clergy, be deemed a satisfactory solution of the question?—I think not. I think it would just produce a much discord in the country as we have at present. I do not think it would be satisfactory at all. You must have separate denominational training schools. The training schools should be like in character to the general schools throughout the country. If the ordinary schools be denominational, the training schools should be denominational, and it is one of the considerations of the present Board, that there are now more than 4,000 schools under Catholic teachers, and no mixed, while the training school is mixed, and has not any Catholic distinctive element in it.

[Adjourned.]

SEVENTY-THIRD DAY.—DUBLIN, SATURDAY, MAY 29, 1869.

PRESENT :

The Right Hon. The Earl of Power, *Chairman*.

REV. DAVID WILSON, B.D.

REV. BENJAMIN MORGAN COWIE, B.D.

WILLIAM K. SULLIVAN, Esq., J.B. 2.

GEORGE A. C. MAY, Esq., q.c.

D. B. DUNNE, Esq.,

} *Secretaries*.JAMES H. OWEN, Esq., *sworn and examined*.

May 29, 1869.

James H.  
Owen, Esq.

37468. The *Chairman*.—How long have you been attached to the Board of Works?—I have been architect thirteen or fourteen years I think, but I have been about twenty-one years in their employment altogether. My father having been their architect before me, and I having learned the profession in his office, I have been engaged the whole time. I have been in the profession more or less in the service of the Board, though not paid by them longer than the time I mention.

37469. Were the original plans of any of the existing model schools designed by you?—Yes.

37470. Can you mention some of them?—I think I may say I designed them all through; some of them were executed during the time my father was architect of the Board. I had almost exclusive charge of that business. They were the model schools at Cork, Ough, Newtownstewart, Carnocktergus, Pansinstown, Mungah, Londonderry, Ballymoe, Sligo and Laragh. Newtownstewart school was built under the superintendence of the Board of Works, but the plans had been made before the transfer of the business to them.

37471. Are the clerks of works throughout the country subject to your control, or are you responsible for the way in which they discharge their duties?—I am responsible.

37472. Does the duty of seeing that they do their work properly and efficiently, and of reporting there if they do not lie in your department, or in that of Mr. Stack, the chief clerk?—It properly lies in my department, but in order to save time a great many communications go direct to them from the Secretary's department stating that particular buildings are to be inspected. It is merely an order to inspect; there is no professional instruction to accompany the order, and the order goes direct from the Secretary's office. Of course they do not know whether the order is obeyed or not.

37473. Do not the clerks of the works report to you what orders they have received, and whether they have completed them or not?—They now send up a sort of diary, a monthly report, and that states all the places that have been inspected. We compare that but occasionally to see whether the men are visiting places and not sending up reports.

37474. When any instructions are sent directly from the chief clerk's office to clerks of works to inspect or report upon particular buildings, is any communication made to you?—Not of any ordinary routine work. If it were anything of importance there would be a communication made.

37475. Have you any means of knowing what orders of this sort have been given to the clerks of works?—No, my lord.

37476. May not the execution of these orders to inspect different places occupy a considerable portion of the time of the clerks of works?—It does occupy nearly all their time.

37477. How can you be responsible for the due employment of their time by the clerks of works if orders can be sent to them from another branch of the office of which you are in no wise cognisant?—Can any man in which there might be an excess for a man doing things he ought not to do, or leaving where things be should do, but we have several checks upon them. For instance, a clerk's bill for travelling expenses must come up and be certified in my office, and that is always compared with the re-

ports that come up of the places he has inspected. They have a great deal of inspection to do without receiving orders at all. A man would perhaps have 150 minor schools along with other buildings, and we don't require him to refrain from visiting a school until he gets a special order to go. He is held responsible for the whole of the schools of the district being in good order. The orders to inspect would be generally in cases of new buildings.

37478. In this diary the clerk of works sends up to you, does he specify which of his journeys have been undertaken by directions from the chief clerk?—No, my lord, I think not.

37479. If you want to check or tax his bill for travelling expenses, have you any means of getting any information from the other side of the office as to what they have ordered?—I could get that information at any time if I thought it necessary.

37480. Do I understand there is no usual mode established of your acquiring that information?—It is not a part of the routine that we make such an inquiry. We take it for granted the men had had business to do in going to a certain place from their own knowledge, and on requisitions from local officers not belonging to the Board of Works. Frequent inspections are made upon such requisitions. For instance, a collector of customs would have authority to call the attention of our clerk of works to works or repairs that may be required. It is the same with respect to inspectors of National schools. It is part of our system that a clerk of works shall receive and act upon information that certain works are wanted and that certain buildings are out of repair. Without waiting for orders from head-quarters, he often writes out a specification and gets tenders for works.

37481. That is for casual repairs?—The ordinary maintenance of buildings I call them.

37482. In that case does the clerk of works report to you at whose instigation he has given these orders?—Not as a rule, not necessarily. He uses his discretion in the matter to explain if he got the information from any party, or if it was merely from his own knowledge he thought the work was necessary.

37483. Would it not be desirable he should report more fully to you, and that when applications are made to him on these matters he should state to you from whom they came?—That statement I should say always comes in a case of anything of importance, but that work is to a great extent the mere maintenance of buildings.

37484. You will see at page 620 of the evidence given before this commission a list given in by Mr. Stack, the chief clerk of the Board of Works, of the National school houses for which grants have been made, and which are either in course of construction or the plans for which are in course of preparation?—I see it.

37485. Are there many of these applications made in the years 1867 and 1868, but not yet completed?—I really cannot answer the question, in the majority of instances these buildings are carried on by local parties. We have merely to see that the work is properly done, and pay the amount of the grant when the work is finished. It is not like a contract with a builder where we tie a man down to a particular time. In many places it is a great convenience to the parties, especially to clerical persons, to speed the work over a long time. By so doing they save a great deal of

May 23, 1863.

James H.  
D. M., Esq.

each outlay, for they get subscriptions in kind and in labour from farmers. If we were to tie them down to time, this assistance would not, generally speaking, be available. It is their interest to get the school built. All we have to do is to see that the work is properly done and pay the grant.

27486. In the case of vested schools, the proportion paid by the Board of Works, or by the National Board, two-thirds of the entire cost—Two-thirds, not exceeding the amount of a certain fixed scale, proportional to the size of the school.

27487. Look to Table B, put in by Mr. Stack, and explain why the amount of the grant is there stated to be only one-third of the amount of the whole cost?—I see it, and it is quite new to me. I thought the grant was invariably two-thirds, I know in one case which I see given here, that the proportion was different, but, with that exception, I was always under the impression the grant was two-thirds.

27488. You are not able to explain that?—I am not.

27489. In those cases in which the total cost of the school is less than the original estimate, do you take any steps to secure that the Government should receive on their grant of two-thirds their proportion of the saving?—If the Board are themselves expending the money, which happens in some instances, especially in out-of-the-way places, the rule has been to divide the total cost, irrespective of the estimate into three parts, and give the patron credit for any saving there is on his one-third. We never, I think, have exceeded the amount of the estimate, but if there is any saving, we give the patron the benefit of it. There may be an instance or two, but I don't remember one in which the patron has asked for less grant.

27490. On what principle do you not secure a proportionate share of any saving to the State?—I think the thing is in this way, that the State has made a bargain with a patron—if you will erect a certain building, according to plans and specifications, we will give you a certain sum towards the cost. It would be a very difficult thing to prove, and frequently a very dangerous principle to go upon, to attempt to prove what was the proportion between the actual cost and the estimated cost. There are many places in which such a principle would open the opposite, "Oh, your grant is not two-thirds of my actual outlay, you must give me more."

27491. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—What becomes of the rule in that case as to the proportion to be paid by the State—is it totally ignored?—No, I think it is practically adhered to, because the grant is in every case founded on an estimate, definite plans, and definite specifications, and two-thirds of the amount is given and no more.

27492. The Chairman.—When the work is executed by the patron is he not obliged to send in the accounts for you to certify in order to receive the Government money?—No, I have never known an instance of it.

27493. Is the money paid to him by the National Board or by your Board?—By the Board of Works. The amount is voted for us by Parliament.

27494. Do they pay the Government money to the patron simply on a report that the building is completed?—Yes.

27495. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Would not a practical adherence to the rule be the refunding of a proportionate share to the State?—I think it would raise very great difficulty. For instance, in the case of a country clergyman of any persuasion getting the aid and the assistance in kind, it would be an exceedingly difficult thing to measure the exact value of it.

27496. The Chairman.—Would the buildings be better executed if the Board of Works were in all cases to meet on doing the work themselves, as they give two-thirds of the money?—I have no doubt they would, without at the same time meaning that they are badly executed at present. As a general rule it is good enough strong work.

27497. Who makes the estimate in the case of a new school to be built as a vested school?—I think there is, practically speaking, no estimate ever made.

We never can get the old plans of vested schools carried out for the amount of the estimate. There has never been an instance of the Board being able to carry out these plans themselves. We are obliged to simplify them very considerably in order to get them done for the money. I mention that as showing that so far as we have the means of knowing the estimate is an exceedingly narrow one.

27498. Is the estimate insufficient?—I should certainly say it was if the Government were to build all the schools upon the old plans.

27499. Have you any estimate for all parts of the country?—There is a schedule applying to all parts of the country and to schools of all sizes.

27500. Is there not a wide difference in the cost of building in different parts of the country?—There is very considerable.

27501. Then what is the use of having one estimate for all parts of the country?—It might be more accurate perhaps to have a separate estimate for each separate school, but it would enormously increase the labour of the department, and would also, I think, increase the Government expenditure.

27502. Suppose a patron writes from any particular place, say the county Down, to say he desires to build a vested school for a given number of children, and requests to know what the cost would be, how should you proceed in your office?—The rule would be to send him the printed plans and specifications, unless he wished to have the plan varied.

27503. What steps should you take to finish him with an estimate of the cost?—That would be fixed according to the size of the school.

27504. Would it be fixed without any communication with the clerk of works in the neighbourhood to know what would be the fair price of the work and the price of materials?—The clerk of works would always inspect the site of the proposed school, make his arrangements as to enclosures, and his estimate for the work, and then the grant would be offered—we will give a grant of so much towards that particular school.

27505. Supposing an application comes in from a place in the county Down to know what the cost of the school for a certain number of children would be, would your estimate be sent to the applicant from Dublin or by the local clerk of works?—From Dublin, a printed estimate applying to the particular class of school he is going to build.

27506. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Does your clerk never inquire as to the probable cost in the immediate district as compared with other districts of the county?—He must from his experience of the locality be a thoroughly good judge of the value of work in the district.

27507. But is that at all taken into account in your estimate for that district?—It is not. We know from experience that there can be very little saving in carrying out these schools if everything were put down with the money value; and we know, as I said, from our own experience, that we cannot get contractors, generally speaking, to build these schools at the rates.

27508. The Chairman.—Supposing a patron desires to build a school, he contributing his one-third quota, how is the surplus defrayed?—What we have always done up to the present time is to simplify the plan, taking unnecessary expenses out of them, and rather improve them, taking out cut-stone largely to the gables, and such details as that.

27509. If these are improvements in the plans why do you not adopt them generally?—They are in process of being adopted. A great many schools in the county Kerry very recently are in progress of being built upon a modified plan to meet one particular case. I think it was that of Liscarnock, where the school that was required was very large, and the amount of grant that would be given very small in proportion to it. I don't know what was the reason, but I was informed that the usual proportionate grant to the number of scholars could not be given in that instance. It is one of those in Mr. Stack's list in which he says only one-

ward of the grant was contributed. If the patron lodges his one-third of the estimated cost to the credit of the Board, the Board proceed to carry out the work.

27510. In the case of an application for a new school, what time generally elapses before the plan is sent from you over to the local manager?—That I cannot well answer, for I don't think there ought to be any delay whatever. There does frequently occur an apparent delay in the interval between the applicant knowing the school is approved of, and the lease being agreed. I know two or three instances where on making inquiry I found that though the applicant had been informed his application was approved, yet from the lease not being completed of course no step whatever could be taken as regards the building.

27511. But supposing a person applies for a new school, how long is it before the plan is sent from your office to him?—The application would be made to the Education Board, and until the Education Board send to the Board of Works a statement that the lease is completed and that the school may go on, we don't have anything of the case except that our clerk of works has made an inspection, and a report for the information of the Education Board. But so soon as we receive word from the Education Board that the case is complete, then by that post or the next the plan ought to go out unless it is a case where new plans have to be made. Where I have to make new plans I think we have them generally out in time, varying from ten days to a month, according to the pressure upon our drawing office.

27512. When the manager has got the foundations into the level of the ground, he is required to notify this to you before proceeding further, that you may inspect them?—Yes.

27513. Within what average time would your clerk of works be able to inspect and report to you?—He certainly ought to be able within a couple of months, I mean by that he would not go off a long journey, thirty or forty miles, to inspect one particular job—he could wait until he had got something else further on the road, or in the neighbourhood, so as to save his own time. And the clerk of works often drops in upon these new buildings, without notice, if they happen to be in the neighbourhood.

27514. Is the manager similarly required to report when the building is ready to receive the roof?—I believe so. There are written instructions to the manager requiring him to give notice of these various stages.

27515. Might a similar delay of two months, take place before the visit of the clerk of works?—It might, but the clerk of works ought to be able to have his district so arranged that he would always have something in the neighbourhood to make it worth his while to go there.

27516. Is the report that the foundation or the roof is ready for inspection made to the clerk of works, or is it made to you?—Sometimes to the clerk of works, but more correctly to the Secretary's department. The clerk of works and the patron generally come to know each other from the first inspection and they communicate.

27517. Is any return made to you of those details in inspection by the chief clerk's office in Dublin?—No, I think they send them direct to the clerk of works.

27518. Am I to understand that in another point in which there is a divided empire over the clerk of works between the architect and the chief clerk?—I should say, my lord, almost the only point. It is the one I was referring to previously, but it would not happen once in twelve months that there would be any other communication to the clerk of works in reference to these schools, unless there was some fault found by the education department that things were left undone or neglected.

27519. Would not the progress of works be facilitated if there was more communication between the two sides of the office?—No, my lord, I think it would be rather retarding if it were necessary for me to have

a staff of clerks to keep up a correspondence of the kind. May 29, 1896

27520. Are there any repairs outstanding now for which demands were made upon you during the year 1895?—Some were outstanding up to a few months back, but I don't think there are any at the present moment. We were very unfortunate in one of our district clerks of works.

27521. Do you think it would be possible for your department to undertake the repair of the non-vested schools, which now are little short of 5,600?—I have no doubt of it, but not without very considerable increase of hands. At present there is not an individual in my department that is not overworked. Our clerks of works, three or four of them, have been involved this winter, and in former years from the very work they had to go through.

27522. Do you think these repairs could be conducted as economically by you as by some local authority such as the county surveyor?—I should get them done in most cases very much cheaper than any local authority would.

27523. Do you think you would get them done more cheaply, including the expense of the additional staff you would require, than if they were done under the control of the grand jurists?—I hardly have data enough of my own knowledge to be able to answer the question, but I know we get our work done, and maintain our buildings—at least we think so—at less cost than the War Department.

27524. Mr. Stack states that out of 574 schools that you repair, about 200 apply to you annually for repairs. Do you consider that would be a fair average for a series of years, or that that merely refers to one particular year?—I should have thought that Mr. Stack rather meant, that out of the total number of schools there is about that proportion on which our clerks of works make special visits annually. The others go down on so many schools at £1, or £2, or £3 each, to pay for whitewashing, repairing broken glass, or ordinary trifling repairs of that kind.

27525. Was the southern Cork district subdivided on your representation?—It was.

27526. Had the necessity for that subdivision long been apparent to you?—I had been aware of it for some years past.

27527. What was the reason why you withheld a representation to that effect for so long?—I cannot say it was withheld. It was not specially with reference to that district. That was one of the handiest but they were all too hand.

27528. Has any other district been altered?—There has been one additional office appointed, and the work is now divided amongst six, which used to be done by five.

27529. Does that additional district relieve more than one office?—It relieved all of them but the one in the Belfast district. But the Ballinacree district clerk of works tells me now that the change made in his case proves to be no relief to him at all.

27530. Am I to understand that when that additional district was created, every district was altered except the Belfast one?—Yes, my lord.

27531. Are you familiar with the Kilconnell case, in which so long a delay took place in finishing the National Board with the plans and estimates for the enlargement of the school building?—I do not know the details of that case at all.

27532. Have you no peculiar inspection of a list of works in arrears, or means of ascertaining what works are in arrears, so as to prevent such great delay as occurred in that case?—We have recently established such a thing, but it is not at all easy with nearly 1,100 buildings in charge to follow up all of them.

27533. Mr. Stack in his evidence has stated to us that it was not the habit to require the district clerks of works to send a report at the end of each of their tours of the state in which they found the different buildings. Would it not be desirable such a report should be made to you?—It is made now. That is, the diary I alluded to in a previous answer.

27534. Rev. Dr. Huben. When did that arrange-

May 23, 1869.

James H.  
LORR, C.D.

ment begin?—I cannot say exactly when, but it arose from matters in that district.

27535. The *Chairman*.—Do the clerks of works besides the diaries send in annual reports of the state of things in their districts?—Each clerk sends in to me every year an estimate of the cost of maintaining every building in his district for the year, also of the cost of the works that are outside the maintenance charges, and that specifies everything over £4 or £5.

27536. Is it your habit at the end of the year to call for a return showing what buildings have been completed?—No, because we know what are completed by the fact of our having paid the amount of the contract for the work.

27537. Do you ever check the one against the other so as to see what work is in arrears?—Yes; I do not do it personally, but the surveyors of buildings, who are intermediate between me and the clerks of works, compare these lists.

27538. If a district clerk on his four or five small repairs, how soon does he send in to you an account of the money which he is directed to be expended?—He ought to send it in when giving the order, but the more usual course for them with small repairs is to call on some man in the neighbourhood and make a contract himself with him. I mean for the repair of a house or a roof, and small matters of that kind.

27539. How often does he report these things to you, that you may be able to check those small items of expenditure?—In each individual instance. There is no keeping a running account with any particular building.

27540. Do messengers often apply to your branch of the office for small repairs after vacancies?—I presume they do. I am not quite aware of it personally. I know we often get up bills of that kind.

27541. Would such applications, if sent to Dublin properly come to you, or would they go to the chief clerk's office?—I think they would invariably go to the chief clerk's office, but these applications I am pretty sure do go to the district clerk of works.

27542. Are you aware it was once proposed to give the teachers a small annual sum for keeping windows in repair, and keeping the school-house whitewashed, and doing such like small matters?—It was proposed.

27543. Are you aware of the reason why it was not thought desirable to adopt that proposal?—No, I am not.

27544. Do you think its adoption would conduce to economy?—I really think it would, but one of the difficulties that struck the officers of my department was that it would be difficult to enforce the doing of these repairs.

27545. Would it be difficult to withhold the payment of the annual sum until they were done?—I think myself it would be better for the Board of Works to keep to their present plan of having no money dealing with any officers but those who are immediately in their own department.

27546. If a clerk of works visits a school to which a firm is attached, and finds the gates out of repair over the whole firm, should he report that to you or to the Secretary's office?—He should report it to me, that is to say, if the report came up with the idea of the repairs being done by the Board, it would come up in the shape of a specification for approval in order that the work might be done, but if it were a mere matter of complaint that damage was done without it, being informed that we were to get it repaired, then it would more naturally go to the Secretary's department.

27547. One of the Commissioners who visited the *Dunamway* model school stated that there is no privy to the teacher's house, and near valuable for the female teachers, can you explain how it came to pass that a model school in which the plans were made by the Board, and which was built under the supervision of the Board, should be defective in these particulars?—I should like to see the plans before answering the question, because there is a very great difference of idea as to what the real wants of these places are. I know that since we have had the work we have given

precisely the same amount of accommodation which was adopted in the model schools, built by the architect of the Education Commissioners. We have had in many instances to give additional accommodation—separate closets for infants, for teachers. Sometimes applications came for water-closets inside the houses, and I always try to get the Board to avoid every one of them if I possibly can, they are such a cause of constant expense. In an out of the way place like *Dunamway* you would, I suppose, have to send to Cork for a plumber to do any repairs that would be required.

27548. One of the Commissioners states that in *Ennisceothy* he found the girls and infants were displaced from their rooms on account of repairs not having been executed during the vacation. Can you explain why, in a case like that, the clerk of works did not take measures for doing the work within the vacation—the period of which he might have easily found out?—That presupposes it was the fault of the clerk of works, which I don't think it would be fair to presume without having the file of papers in the case before us. I have known cases in which the clerk of works has been in very good time with his specification, but there have been delays in sending out for tenders, which delays are not chargeable to the clerk of works. What makes me say this is, that the clerk of works is a remarkably steady man, and is always anxious to get his work done so as not to interfere with the schools.

27549. You would admit, I presume, that in the case of extensive repairs to schools, attention should be paid to doing them in the holidays?—Precisely so, that is the rule of the department.

27550. Have the new plans which you prepared for ordinary schools, and which were submitted to the Board of Education been decided upon as yet by that Board?—I think not. I was inquiring about them some months ago, and I was told they had been referred back to the Board of Works to get an estimate made.

27551. Did you hear this casually or were you informed in the office that this back reference had been made?—I don't know how it was I got the subject renewed, and I then made inquiry myself as to where the plans were. I have not been able to find them.

27552. In point of fact, have they been sent back to your office?—I am afraid they must have been sent back, for they change me with them, and yet I cannot find them. They are only drawings, and it is so easy for them to get folded inside some other document.

27553. There is the whole question dormant?—Up to the present it is, but practically it does not press much, because building has got so much more expensive that we are obliged to almost every case to send out special plans from which these have been prepared.

27554. If you have reason to believe those plans have been returned to your office and there lost, why were not fresh plans forwarded at once to the National Board of Education?—My belief that they are lost only arose this very morning, for it so chanced that we were talking about—and with reference to the commission at all, but talking with reference to a school that was being built—and I asked the question if those plans had ever been found. I fully intend to get a new set made.

27555. Do the school Inspectors ever write to your branch of the office to state what repairs they have observed to be required?—Frequently. When I say to my branch of the office, I mean to the local officers who have charge of those districts. Never I should say almost is there any communication with the architect's office in Dublin, except with reference to buildings that are here in our own neighbourhood.

27556. Do you think it would be advisable that the Board of Works should be charged with the repairs of the non-vested schools?—I think the Board of Works would have no difficulty in undertaking the duty. It would be one, though, that would require some years for any one who undertook it, to get them into good condition.



27557. Would it be possible in any case for your department to make arrangements with the county surveyor, where you had confidence in the individual officer, that he should execute small repairs for you?—He is never, I may say, a suitable man. In works of his kind it is far better to have a man who is not so highly educated, but has a more practical education. Most of the county surveyors are civil engineers—very few of them architects.

27558. Has any arrangement yet been made by you for a supply of gas to the school at Glasnevin?—No altered arrangement. They have had a supply of gas for some years past from their own small gas works. There has been a question as to whether it would not be better to get rid of that work and give the Dublin Gas Company a contribution towards the price of a main. That is a question which is still to some extent under consideration. It has been revised within the last few days.

27559. We have been informed that some months ago one of the retorts there failed, and it became a question whether this retort should be repaired or whether the gas works should be abandoned and the supply of gas obtained from the city—has any decision yet been come to in your office as to the settlement of that question?—The Board decided to keep on the existing arrangement. We put in a new retort, and made no change, but very recently the gas company have revised the matter, and there is a new question which, I think, has not turned up before—namely, the extreme probability of a reduction of the price of gas in Dublin.

27560. Have the necessary repairs of the gas works at Glasnevin been made?—They have been maintained from time to time—kept in proper working order.

27561. Do you consider your staff at the present moment is sufficient for the work it has to do throughout the country?—It is not.

27562. Has any representation of the insufficiency of the staff been made by the department to the Government?—I think there has, but of course I should not know that.

27563. To what department would that representation be made?—I presume to the Treasury. In fact, I believe there has been a promise, somewhat hazy, that a Treasury inquiry should take place into the department.

27564. Have any of the cheap £100 schools been built as yet?—I am not sure, but I think there have been one or two.

27565. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—The building of non-vested schools is usually carried on by local parties?—Generally speaking.

27566. Who are the parties generally?—The local manager or the patron.

27567. Now, is the proportion to be paid by the local parties invariably paid before the building is commenced by the Board of Works?—Invariably.

27568. For my part the patron lodges his one-third before the work is proceeded with—where does he take the lodgment?—In any branch of the Bank of Ireland.

27569. Who sees to it as a matter of fact that the lodgment has been made?—The Accountant of the Board of Works sends to the parties an authority for the bank to receive a certain sum of money and until the bank sends him that receipt order, with their acknowledgment of the receipt, he takes no further step in the matter.

27570. On whose account is the money lodged?—The Commissioners of Public Works.

27571. As a matter of fact the Commissioners do not begin the building till the lodgment is made?—They do not.

27572. Have you not just said that to a large extent payment is made in kind and not in money?—That is in cases where the local people build the school. We prefer that the local manager should undertake the whole thing, for, generally speaking, he can get the work better done than the Board of Works can. They have advantages we cannot get—the free use of quarries and such things. In that case no cash passes till

the clerk of works reports the school is complete; then we pay the grant.

27573. But you carry on the work and are responsible for the work from the moment it begins?—No, in the one case we are responsible—we contract with a man to do the work; in the other case, where the patron is building, we have no responsibility about the building whatever. If it is not a suitable building we do not take it off his hand.

27574. With regard to the payments in kind, who makes the valuation?—No one.

27575. So there may be payments in kind or not so far as you know?—Exactly so. We limit ourselves to the inquiry—is the building such as we can fairly and properly take off the heads of the parties who built it and pay the grant.

27576. Now, as a lodgment of payments in kind could not very well be made, do you think, considering the amount of money the State gives, it is desirable to continue such a state of things?—I think so, we find it works uncommonly well, there are very few cases in which we fail to take the schools off the people's hands.

27577. Rev. Mr. Conne.—How many vested schools on an average are there built in the course of the year?—I could not say. We have for some years past taken a vote of £1,900.

27578. For the building of vested schools?—Yes.

27579. How much does each one cost on an average?—I would say the average grant could not be more than £200 or £250.

27580. How many do you build in the year?—I do not suppose we have paid grants for more than fifteen in the year.

27581. Have you for so many?—I doubt if we have paid so many.

27582. Did you design the model schools?—Those last built I did.

27583. Do you do that after receiving any instructions from the Board, or without any such instructions?—Under the instructions of the Board.

27584. What was the nature of those instructions as to internal accommodation or external appearance?—The Education Commissioners invariably supplied us with a schedule of the accommodation they required—for instance, the number of pupils in each division of the schools that were to be accommodated, and also with reference to residence. If anything was incomplete I asked for further instructions as to that. Then from my acquaintance with the schools I made a set of plans that seemed to me to suit the view.

27585. Is any instruction given to you from Marlborough-street about the expense to be incurred in building a model school?—There were instructions given, but none for the last few years. I think they have reasoned with themselves that the Board of Works were responsible for the accommodation being provided at a reasonable cost, and that they were responsible for seeing that the buildings were suitable in point of accommodation.

27586. May I ask you without any offence are you paid by fees or salary?—By salary I am sorry to say.

27587. Then you are not paid by any percentage?—Not at all.

27588. Then it would not be a reasonable conclusion that any officer received any benefit from the large expenditure recently made on model schools?—I am perfectly certain it would not.

27589. Then why are model schools on so expensive a scale compared with the price at which they began?—The scale of the schools has been very much enlarged. The first buildings I designed for the Education Board were minor model schools. The arrangement at first was that for building five of these schools we were directed to insert an estimate of £10,000, but as we went on making plans it became evident £10,000 was no measure whatever of what the reasonable cost of those five schools would be. Some of these so-called minor model schools are very much larger than the old district schools.

27590. Did you receive any instruction from the Board that a model school was to be in design and

May 26, 1880.

James H. Owen, Esq.

May 29, 1895.

James H.  
Owen, Esq.

arrangement a model for other schools in the country?

—No, never.

27591. That idea is completely lost sight of, I presume?—Except in that way—we have always endeavored to keep these buildings of an inexpensive character. The Cork school, for instance, is a very good-looking building, but at the same time if you came to analyze it you will see that it is only from its shape and the disposition of the masses it gets its effect.

27592. Had you any written instructions from the Board as to the points which they wished to be observed in your design?—Certainly not in the sense in which you put the question, that is to say as to its character.

27593. Have you any instructions at all from the Board about the plans of model schools?—None whatever.

27594. You had no paper of instructions which you could produce that we might see what were the conditions put before you when you had to design the model schools?—I think, for instance, with reference to Rensinstown and some later schools, I could find a letter of instructions received from the Education Commissioners, but it was always limited to the amount of accommodation they required.

27595. And nothing else?—There was never any direction to make the building either plain or handsome.

27596. The Chairman.—Was any direction given to you as to the sort of accommodation they wanted, and what points were to be observed in making the original plans of the building?—No, I think not.

27597. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Have they ever suggested anything as to restricting the amount to be expended?—I think never.

27598. In whose hands is the expenditure, in the hands of the Board of Works, or in the hands of the Commissioners of National Education?—In the hands of the Board of Works; they hold themselves responsible to the Treasury for these buildings being erected at a moderate cost.

27599. As between the Board of Works and the Treasury, and not between the Treasury and the Education Commissioners?—I believe so.

27600. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—Do you mean to say that the Commissioners of Education have not exercised any control over either the elevations or the expenditure?—There have been consultations with the Commissioners of Education.

27601. With the Commissioners, or with their officers?—The inevitable rule of the Board of Works, if building for another department—unless there are certain blueprints plans already approved—is to make a plan in a way they think suitable, and send it with an elevation sketches so far detailed as that a very good idea of the cost and appearance of the building could be got. We never build for another department without carrying out that rule.

27602. I am still at a loss to understand why the model schools of late time are so much more expensive than the others?—I almost doubt if that is the fact.

27603. From your own returns the three last model schools have cost £39,009?—The Cork and Enniskillen schools, I don't think I could possibly institute a comparison without having before you the extent of accommodation, as well as the cost. I am very strongly of opinion that if these schools were compared in that way, it would turn out that they were erected at very moderate rates.

27604. The Newry school has been nineteen years in operation, cost £6,570?—The cost of that within the last five years could be increased by actually twenty per cent.

27605. You mean from more expensive materials?—Presumably the same materials and workmanship would cost twenty per cent. more at the present time.

27606. Newtownards school cost upwards of £10,000?—That is an enormous building, and it was a case in which the plans were sent to us to carry out.

27607. Enniskillen school nearly £9,500?—That was also a very exceptional case, from the enormous difficulty of the foundations.

27608. You give that as a reason why that cost nearly as much as the Cork school?—Yes; Cork was an exceedingly expensive plan to build.

27609. Nearly £10,000?—If you compare these buildings with the amount of accommodation in them, and the amount of accommodation in the earlier ones, it will turn out, taking cubic measurements, for instance, that these are by no means dear. The accommodation they have been getting for these schools is very much more complete latterly, an increased number of classrooms, and facilities of every kind.

27610. Do you receive any directions from the National Board as to the internal arrangements?—We do get such instructions, but in this way, that we submit to them our plan showing these arrangements, and I presume they consult their professional officers with reference to these. Indeed I know they do, for they frequently suggest alterations in the mode of arrangement for school-rooms and fittings.

27611. With respect to the infant schools—two of us who visited the model schools found the arrangements uniformly on a bad plan according to our notion—we want to know whether any of the officers of the National Board have ever resented against the plan of the Board of Works for fitting up infant schools?—I have no recollection of any such case, but any remonstrance of that kind would come from them with great authority, and would be sure to be attended to.

27612. Therefore if it has not been attended to you consider none has come?—I am certain of it, because these plans go through my own hands, and I am not aware of what the deficiency is that is referred to.

27613. I wish particularly to know whether the Chiefs of Inspection, or the Head Inspectors have taken notice of certain defects which we have seen in model school buildings, and reported them to the Board of Works or not?—I should not like to answer so general a question. They frequently do call our attention to things which require to be improved, which we provide funds for doing from year to year, but with reference to the general bad arrangement of the infant schools, which I think you are referring to, I do not think that ever has been reported to us.

27614. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Should you be prepared to expect the Board's officers would communicate with you?—Not with me, but with the secretary.

27615. Should you expect the Education Board's officers to communicate with their Commissioners who would notify to you?—That would be the routine; but there is a great deal of non-official communication goes on between myself and officers under us with reference to plans and fittings of that kind.

27616. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—I suppose that would be in this way, that you would be directed to confer with some officer of the other Board?—Yes. Or some officer of another Board thinks a thing is desirable—we have a conference about it before any official communication takes place.

27617. Rev. Dr. Wilson.—Can you say the Commissioners of National Education have ever referred to you with regard to matters indicated by the Royal Commissioners in his examination?—I have no recollection of such a communication, and I do not think any such ever came. In many places they are suggesting the interests of the two sexes in infant schools. That is one alteration referred to.

27618. Rev. Mr. Cowie.—The point to which I refer is this—the gallery in the infant room is always put under the window, the most inconvenient place in the room—as you have adopted that plan uniformly as far as possible, it seems that no remonstrance was addressed to you by those interested in school keeping. It is a point as to which representations ought naturally to have come from officers of the Board familiar with schools. I wish to know whether any such suggestions have ever been made to you?—Never, I am positive about that.

27619. Did you build the Lichessie Model School?—No.

27620. Have you ever received any instruction in designing the residence for the master to take care

that the domestic portion is perfectly separated from the pupil teachers' department?—Never; any positive measures to that effect. In designing these I always followed pretty much the arrangement of the existing model schools.

27621. Do you know the agricultural school at Rathfriland?—I do not.

27622. I put this to you as a summary of the questions to which I have been trying to get an answer from you. I want to know whether your plans for the internal arrangement of model schools are ever criticised by the Board in a utilitarian sense?—We take it for granted that they are, because they are sent to the Education Board and they come back with their approval.

27623. We may take these model schools as approved in all their arrangements by the proper officers of the National Board of Education?—So we presume.

27624. The other point was, that you received no instructions about the expensive elevations which have been adopted in the later model schools—that has been from the Board of Works only?—From the Board of Works only. I rather general with the term for an endowment has been always to put up the building with a certain amount of appearance, but as cheap as such buildings can be done.

27625. Then you object to my describing them as almost palatial?—I have endeavoured to make them look like schools. I think they contrast very favourably with some of the buildings done before us.

27626. Do they contrast very fairly with school buildings?—I think so, such as Belinah, and the agricultural school at Cork, and one at Newtownards—they are of a much more expensive character than those built by the Board of Works.

27627. Under what circumstances was the school at Newtownards built on so expensive a scale? Were the plans referred to you?—They were sent ready made. I wanted to be allowed to redesign the interior, but I believe this had been approved of by the Marquis of Londonderry, and they were unwilling to make any change.

27628. Was he not the donor of the site?—I am not sure.

27629. Mr. Sullivan—When plans are sent from the Board of Works to the Board of Education, do you send the specifications of the cost with them?—We do not usually, because before the thing comes to that stage a sum of money has been usually provided in the parliamentary vote.

27630. Who makes out the estimate in the first instance for parliament?—Generally speaking we have received an intimation that we are to provide for a model school to be built, and that it is to be about on the same scale as some other model school. That has enabled us to put a sum before the Treasury for approval, and it frequently has occurred that a long time has elapsed before any plan could be made from the difficulty in getting sites.

27631. Who really is responsible for the amount spent on any given place—has the Board of Education any vote on the amount proposed to be spent?—I think they have not. I think their responsibility would be limited to specifying the accommodation they required, and then the responsibility would be on the Board of Works to provide that accommodation without incurring undue expense.

27632. The Board of Education does not inquire at all into the cost?—I do not think they do. I think they look upon it that it is the business of the Board of Works, and that the Board of Works are responsible to the Treasury for it.

27633. In what form does the application go from the Board of Works?—Is it an application stating that a school is proposed to be built?—Yes, at a certain price.

27634. How many classes of officers are permanently

employed in your department?—There is an assistant architect, three surveyors of buildings, who each take portion of Ireland, and six clerks of works.

27635. The district surveyors, they divide Ireland into three parts?—Into three parts—each has a certain portion of Dublin, and his own portion of the country.

27636. Is it possible for each surveyor to visit in each year all the buildings that are under his care?—Quite impossible, nor is it at all necessary.

27637. What proportion of their time is spent out of Dublin in each year?—I should say about one-fourth of the time.

27638. Do you think it possible for six clerks of works to superintend the whole of the school buildings that are at present under the Board, and the other public works that are placed under them?—I am quite of opinion that the staff is not strong enough.

27639. Besides these schools, what other buildings are under them?—I may say every building that belongs to the Crown in Ireland, except those that are in charge of the War Department—that includes convalescent hospitals, coast guard stations, custom houses, and the various offices of the revenue and public departments, such as post-office offices in Ireland.

27640. Taking the present amount of work to be done, how many clerks of works should be added to do the work effectively?—There should be at least one more, and they should be given an allowance to pay for the assistance of a boy to act as clerk. The amount of writing and correspondence is something enormous.

27641. If the present number of schools were doubled what addition should be made to the staff?—Then efficiency would very much increase as their numbers increase, for that decreases the area they have to travel over. The loss of time in travelling is what they feel most.

27642. What power have the clerks of works of getting repairs executed in the schools of their respective districts?—Their orders are to write a specification of the work at each place, whether a school or a coast guard station—to send that up for approval. It is then sent down, and tenders taken for executing the works. But in case of the thing being pressing he has full power of attending to them at once, and getting them done in the cheapest and most expeditious manner.

27643. In the case for example, of a hinge on a door, a slate or a broken pane of glass?—I should say that with reference to the hinge of the door or broken glass he would not think it necessary to go specially out of his way to expedite the matter, but a staff of a roof may cause serious damage to a building.

27644. He has some discretionary power as to the immediate execution of repairs?—He has and he would be very severely censured if he knew urgent repairs were wanted and that he did not go out of the usual routine to get them done.

27645. If the schools were double the number what addition should be made to your staff?—That would depend very much upon their distribution seeing that in every parish in Ireland there is at least a school. We have about 579 at present.

27646. If you were to take charge of every school in Ireland, over 5,000?—It would require a very large increase of the staff, but I do not see any impossibility in managing it.

27647. How far do you think the organization of the Board of Works would be suitable for the extension of the duties of repairing schools?—I think there ought to be no difficulty in undertaking charge of every school in every parish in Ireland. Practically the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have a building in every parish in Ireland which they maintain.

27648. Do you think it would be advisable to throw on the Board of Works the repairs of the schools?—I almost think that probably it would be worth while to have an organization for the schools themselves outside the Board of Works.

[Adjourned.]

May 26, 1869.

James H. Owen, att.



APPENDIX  
TO  
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE  
TAKEN BEFORE THE  
ROYAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY  
INTO  
PRIMARY EDUCATION, IRELAND.



# APPENDIX TO MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

## APPENDIX No. I.

### NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—SENIOR PAID MONITORS.

[See Question 296, page 12—Evidence of the Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell.]

#### QUALIFICATIONS OF CANDIDATES.

*Appointment*.—I. The selection should be made, as far as possible, from those who have shown a taste for teaching.

II. The candidates should not be under fourteen nor over sixteen years of age. They must be of a sound and healthy constitution, and free from any physical defect likely to impair their efficiency as teachers.

III. The school to which the candidate belongs should exhibit a tolerable degree of efficiency, should have a sufficient average attendance to require a senior paid monitor, and the teacher should be qualified to give instruction in the prescribed course.

IV. The candidates will be required—

*Reading*.—1st. To read the Third Book fluently, and to answer, with readiness, the explanatory questions arising from lessons selected in this and the earlier books.

*Spelling*.—2nd. To spell correctly the words occurring in any portion of these lesson books.

*Writing*.—3rd. To write small hand neatly and legibly.

*Grammar*.—4th. To refer to their respective parts of speech the words in the lessons selected for examination.

*Geography*.—5th. To have a knowledge of the elements of geography, and to be acquainted with the outlines of the map of the world.

*Arithmetic*.—6th. To work with readiness and accuracy, any case in the Simple and Compound Rules, in Reduction and Proportion.

*Art of Teaching*.—7th. To teach a junior class to the satisfaction of the District Inspector.

*Needlework*.—8th. In addition to the above qualifications, females must be able to sew neatly, and to knit.

#### JUNIOR PAID MONITORS.—GENERAL CONDITIONS AS TO APPOINTMENT, &c., &c.

I. The selection to be made from those who have manifested an aptitude for teaching.

II. The candidates must have completed their tenth year. They must be of a healthy constitution, and free from any physical defect likely to impair their efficiency as teachers.

III. The school for which the candidate is recommended must exhibit an overall average attendance of not less than thirty-five pupils, and the teacher of the school must rank not lower than first division of candidates.

IV. The salary granted will be—

For the first year,	£2
“ second,	£3.
“ third,	£4.

V. The candidate must be certified by the Inspector recommending, as having passed a satisfactory examination on the following subjects, and as qualified to the extent noted in regard to each—

*Reading*.—To be able to read the Third Book with tolerable fluency, and to be able to answer on the lessons contained in the Second Book.

*Spelling*.—To know the spelling of the words in the Second Book.

*Writing*.—To be able to write small hand.

*Grammar*.—To know the parts of speech.

*Geography*.—To know the outlines and general features of the map of the World.

*Arithmetic*.—To know Notation and Numeration, to

be familiar with the Multiplication and Pence Tables, and to be able to solve questions in the Simple and Compound Rules.

VI. To entitle the junior paid monitors to a continuance of the salary, they will be required, as in the case of the senior paid monitors, to pass a yearly examination, when, in addition to improved proficiency in the above-mentioned subjects, they must be prepared to answer in the following books—

*After the end of the First Year.*

Second Book.—An accurate knowledge of the lessons in the book.

Spelling Book Superseded.—Verbal Distinctions.—Class Ist.

Sullivan's Grammar.—From beginning to the end of the Inflections of the Noun.

Introduction to Geography.—The Definitions.

All the Reduction Tables, with the first Eight Rules for Mental Calculation, as contained in the Board's Small Arithmetic.

*After the end of the Second Year.—additional*

Third Book, to page 35 inclusive.—To know the lessons of this book, and to be able to explain the words occurring in it.

Spelling Book Superseded.—Verbal Distinctions.—Classes 2nd and 3rd.

Sullivan's Grammar.—The Inflections, &c., of the Adjectives and Pronouns.

Introduction to Geography.—The Boundaries, Climate, and general Divisions of Europe and Asia.

The remaining Rules for Mental Calculation in the Small Arithmetic.

*After the end of the Third Year.*

Third Book.—To be able to read this with ease and correctness, and to know the lessons contained in it.

Spelling Book Superseded.—Verbal Distinctions.—Classes 4th and 5th.

Sullivan's Grammar.—The Verb—its Inflections, &c.

Introduction to Geography.—The Boundaries, Climate, and general Divisions of Africa and America.

Writing and Dictation.—To be able to write small hand neatly and legibly, and to be able to write from memory, with correct spelling and punctuation, any of the pieces of poetry occurring in the Second or Superseded Books.

Arithmetic.—To know the definitions of the Rules of Proportion, as contained either in Thomson's Arithmetic, or in the Board's larger Treatise, and to be able to work with readiness questions in Reduction and Proportion, Simple and Compound.

In each year the monitors will be required to exhibit satisfactory progress in the art of teaching. The females must exhibit to the Inspectors samples of their needlework, to afford proof that due attention has been given to the branches of needlework allotted to their capacity.

As regards the annual examinations of the junior paid monitors, the District Inspectors are to examine these young persons in the schools to which they respectively belong, at the first inspection which may be held after the termination of each year's course.

A gratuity of not more than one pound each year will be awarded at the end of the year, on recommendation of Head and District Inspectors, to those teachers whose monitors shall pass the examination in a satisfactory manner. The Head and District Inspectors to forward, at the end of the year, on the forms provided, their recommendations for these gratuities.

By order,

JAMES KELLY, }  
W. H. NEWELL, } Secretaries

Education Office, January, 1868.

APPENDIX,  
No. 1.

APPENDIX,  
No. 2.

## APPENDIX No. II.

## NATIONAL EDUCATION, IRELAND.—RETURN OF BUILDINGS AND REPAIRS, year 1856-7.

[See Question 771, page 30.—Evidence of the Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell.]

	£	s.	d.
Ordinary National Schools, . . . . .	2,928	6	3
Model Agricultural Schools, including Albert Farm, . . . . .	7,795	7	8
District Model Schools, . . . . .	5,014	18	9
Training Establishments, . . . . .	879	9	1
Metropolitan Schools, . . . . .	1,166	1	7
Official Establishments, . . . . .	1,375	19	0
Architect and Clerks of Works, . . . . .	1,081	14	2
	412,421	10	5

APPENDIX,  
No. 3.

## APPENDIX No. III.

## FORM OF EXISTING LEASE TO TRUSTEES.

[See Question 993, page 32.—Mr. Keenan's evidence.]

THIS INDENTURE made the day of \_\_\_\_\_ in the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Sixty \_\_\_\_\_ between \_\_\_\_\_ of the first part

Trustees for the purposes hereinafter mentioned of the second part, and the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland of the third part. WHEREAS the object of the system of National Education is to afford civilized literacy and moral, and appropriate religious instruction to children of all persuasions so far as possible in the same school, upon the fundamental principle that no attempt shall be made to interfere with the peculiar religious tenets of any description of Christian people. AND WHEREAS the said \_\_\_\_\_ desires that a National school, to be called \_\_\_\_\_ National school, should be established on the principles aforesaid, and a suitable school-house and premises for the same to be built and erected on the lot of ground hereinafter described, and for that purpose that the said lot of ground should be devised to and vested in the said \_\_\_\_\_ who have been nominated as trustees of the said intended National school and premises, and have been approved of by the said Commissioners of National Education. AND WHEREAS the sum required for the building and erecting the said intended school-house and the furnishing and furnishing thereof amounts to the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ AND WHEREAS application hath been made to the said Commissioners of National Education to approve of a grant in aid of the said sum so required.

AND WHEREAS the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ sterling has been raised, or is intended to be raised by voluntary contribution or local subscriptions towards defraying the expenses of the building, furnishing and furnishing said intended school-house. AND WHEREAS the said Commissioners of National Education have, in order to promote the establishment of the said school, by minute bearing date the day of \_\_\_\_\_ in the year of Our Lord \_\_\_\_\_ approved of the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ sterling to make up the estimated sum of \_\_\_\_\_ sterling, being paid out of the funds voted by Parliament to the Commissioners of Public Works for the erection of National schools in Ireland.

NOW KNOW YE, THAT WHEREAS the said \_\_\_\_\_ in order to promote the said object, and in consideration of the said sum of \_\_\_\_\_ by the said Commissioners of National Education so approved to be paid as aforesaid, by these presents grant and demise unto the said \_\_\_\_\_ and their executors, administrators, and assigns, all that lot of ground, described in the map thereof, on these presents delineated, situate in the townland of \_\_\_\_\_ parish of \_\_\_\_\_ barony of \_\_\_\_\_ and county of \_\_\_\_\_ containing \_\_\_\_\_ and bounded \_\_\_\_\_ To hold the same to the said \_\_\_\_\_ and their executors, administrators, and assigns, from \_\_\_\_\_ day of the date of these presents for and during \_\_\_\_\_

Nevertheless upon the trusts hereinafter mentioned they the said \_\_\_\_\_ and their executors, administrators, and assigns, yielding therefore during the said demise the rent of one penny on the feast of Saint Michael in every year, if same shall be demanded. And it is hereby declared that the said demise is to make upon trust that a National School in connexion with the said Commissioners of National Education

shall at all times, during the term aforesaid, be maintained upon the said premises, and that every school to be kept on the premises hereby demise shall be subject to the rules and regulations of the said Commissioners of National Education applicable to schools vested in trustees, which rules are specified in the schedule enclosed heron, signed by the Secretaries of the said Commissioners of National Education. PROVIDED that in case they the said \_\_\_\_\_ and or other of them, their or any of their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, or any future trustee to be hereafter appointed by virtue of these presents, shall die or be deemed of being discharged from the trust hereby created, or shall go or reside out of Ireland for a continuous period of twelve calendar months, or shall neglect or refuse for three calendar months after demand made in writing by the said grantor, his heirs, executors, and assigns, or by the said Commissioners of National Education or their successors, to carry out the trusts of these presents according to the true intent hereof, or become incapable to execute such trusts, it shall and may be lawful to and for the surviving or continuing trustee or trustees to nominate and appoint a new trustee or trustees in the room of any such trustee or trustees, every such new trustee or trustees to be first approved of by the said Commissioners of National Education or their successors for the time being, and in case any such surviving or continuing trustee or trustees shall neglect or refuse to exercise the powers of appointment hereby given as aforesaid within six calendar months after all or any of the events herebefore mentioned shall take place, or in case the office of trustee shall, from any cause whatever, be wholly vacant for the space of twelve calendar months, that then, and in all or any of such cases, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said Commissioners of National Education or their successors for the time being to nominate and appoint such new trustee or trustees in the room of any such trustee or trustees as aforesaid, upon the like trusts as are hereinafter mentioned, and that thereupon the said premises herebefore mentioned shall be conveyed and assigned as in that the same shall vest in such new trustee or trustees so to be nominated and approved as aforesaid, either jointly with any surviving or continuing trustee, or solely as the case may require upon the like trusts, and to and for and subject to the like uses, limits, regulations, conditions and purposes as are herebefore mentioned, expressed, and declared as referred to, of and concerning the same. PROVIDED ALWAYS, that the person in whose name any new trustee shall be appointed as aforesaid shall not be liable for anything done or neglected after such appointment. AND the said \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ do hereby for themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly, and each of them doth for himself, his heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, severally covenant with the said Commissioners of National Education and their successors for the time being as aforesaid in manner following, that it is to say, that they the said trustees as aforesaid, and each of them, their and each of their executors, administrators, and assigns, shall and will from time to



and at all times hereafter, well, truly, diligently, and faithfully do, execute, and perform all and every the uses, trusts, regulations and conditions, and for the purposes heretofore mentioned, expressed, and declared, or referred to, and in them, as such trustees, reposed. And in case it shall happen that any time hereafter default shall be made in the due execution and performance of all or any of the said trusts, regulations, uses, conditions, and purposes heretofore mentioned and expressed, that then and in all ways of such use or uses they the said trustees, or one of them, then or one of their heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns shall or will, if required by the said Commissioners of National Education or their successors for the time being, well and truly pay or cause to be paid back unto the said Commissioners of Public Works or their successors for the time being, as aforesaid, the said sum of \_\_\_\_\_ sterling, so paid in aid of the section of said National school as aforesaid. And the said \_\_\_\_\_ for heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, by these presents, and they the said \_\_\_\_\_ and for themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, do by these presents covenant with the said Commissioners of National Education and their successors for the time being as aforesaid, that the said heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, and they the said \_\_\_\_\_ and each of them, their said and each of their executors, administrators, and assigns, shall and will, from time to time, and at all times hereafter upon the request of the said Commissioners of National Education or their successors for the time being, and at their own proper costs and charges, do, perform, and execute all and every such further and other act and assentance in the law whatsoever, as well for observing and confirming these presents, as also for the further and better demising, assenting, and confirming all and singular the heretofore granted and devised land and premises, to the several uses, and upon, for, and subject to the several trusts, intents, regulations, and purposes hereby respectively mentioned, expressed, and declared, of and concerning the same as by the said Commissioners of National Education or their successors, for the time being, their or any of their counsel learned in the law shall in that behalf be reasonably advised, demanded, required, demanded, or directed. Provided always, and it is hereby declared that it shall be lawful for the trustees or trustee for the time of these presents, with the approbation of the Commissioners of National Education in behalf for the time being, testified by deed under their Common Seal, and with the consent in writing of the said \_\_\_\_\_ or other the person or persons for the time being entitled beneficially to the said premises, hereby demised, in reversion, expectant upon the term hereby granted by any deed or deeds executed by the said trustee or trustees in the presence of and attested by two or more witnesses, to revoke all or any of the trusts and purposes heretofore declared concerning the premises hereby demised. And that thereupon it shall be lawful for the trustee or trustees for the time being of these presents with the consent in writing of the said \_\_\_\_\_ or other the person or persons for the time being, entitled beneficially to the said premises hereby demised, in reversion, expectant upon the term hereby granted by any deed or deeds attested as aforesaid to dedicate such new or other trusts concerning the same, as to the said trustee or trustees shall seem meet. Provided also that if the trustees or trustee for the time being of these presents shall pay or cause to be paid to the said Commissioners of Public Works or their successors the said sum of \_\_\_\_\_ together with such further sum or sums as the said Commissioners shall hereafter expend in additions or improvements to the said school, then and in such case all and every the trusts and purposes heretofore declared concerning the premises hereby

granted shall cease and be void. PROVIDED that in computing the amount of any additional sums expended by the said Commissioners, no money shall be taken into account expended in any year on which the entire sum so expended by them shall be less than twenty-five pounds. In WITNESS whereof the said \_\_\_\_\_ hereunto put \_\_\_\_\_ hand and seal and the said Commissioners have caused their Corporate Seal to be affixed thereto the day and year first before written.

Signed, Sealed, and Delivered  
by the said \_\_\_\_\_

## SCHEDULE OF RULES REFERRED TO IN THE DEED.

## PART I.

§ I.—3. The Commissioners by themselves, or their officers, are to be allowed to visit and examine the schools whenever they think fit.

§ II.—1. The schools to which the Commissioners grant aid are divided into two classes, viz.—1st, vested schools, of which there are two sets, namely, first, those vested in the Commissioners; and second, those vested in trustees, for the purpose of being maintained as National schools; 2ndly, non-vested schools, the property of private individuals. Both these classes of schools are under the control of local patrons or managers.

§ III.—2. No National school-house shall be employed, at any time, even temporarily, as the seated place of Divine Worship of any religious community; or for the instruction or advertisement of the managers or rights of any Church.

3. Vested school-houses must be used exclusively for the education of the pupils attending them, except on Sundays, when they may be employed for Sunday schools, with the sanction of the patron or managers, subject, in cases leading to contention or abuse, to the interference of the Commissioners.

6. No political meetings shall be held in National school-houses, whether vested or non-vested; nor shall any political business whatsoever be transacted therein.

7. When any school is received by the Commissioners into connexion with them, the inscription, "NATIONAL SCHOOL" shall be put up in plain and legible characters on the school-house or on each other place as may render it conspicuous to the public. When a school-house is built partly by aid from the State, a stone is to be introduced into the wall having that inscription cut upon it. The Commissioners will not, when granting aid to a school, sanction any inscription containing a title of a denominational character, or which may appear to them to indicate that the school is one belonging to any particular religious body. The Commissioners do not object to the terms, male, female, or infant; or to the proper local designation taken from the city, town, parish, street, village, or township at which the school may be situated; or to the name of the founder being included in the inscription.

8. No emblems or symbols of a denominational nature shall be exhibited in the school-room, during the hours of seated instruction; nor will the Commissioners, in future, grant aid to any school which exhibits on the exterior of the buildings any such emblem.

9. No emblems or symbols of a political nature shall at any time be exhibited in the school-room, or affixed to the exterior of the buildings; nor shall any placard whatsoever, except such as refer to the legitimate business of school management, be affixed therein.

§ IV.—1. Opportunities are to be afforded (as heretofore provided) to the children of all National schools for receiving such religious instruction as their parents or guardians approve of.

2. Religious instruction must be so arranged, that each school shall be open to children of all denominations; that due regard be had to parental right and authority; that accordingly no child shall receive, or be present at any religious instruction of which his parents or guardians disapprove; and that the time for giving it be so fixed that no child shall be thereby, in effect, expelled, directly or indirectly from the other advantages which the school affords.

3. A public notification of the times for religious instruction such as is inserted in large letters in the "Two T's," supplied by the Commissioners, who recommend that, as far as may be practicable, the general nature of such religious instruction be also stated therein.

4. The "Two T's" must be kept constantly being up in a conspicuous place in the school-room.

5. When the religious instruction commences after the usual, the teacher must, immediately before the commence-

If the greater desire to reserve to himself and his representatives the right of being a party to the revocation of the trusts, the following words, "with the consent in writing of the said [grantor], his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns," should be inserted at \*

ment of the former, announce distinctly to the pupils that the hour for religious instruction has arrived, and must, at the same time, put up and keep up, during the period allotted to such religious instruction, and within the view of all the pupils, a notification thereof, containing the words, "Religious instruction," printed in large characters, on a card to be supplied by the Commissioners. Similarly when the school commences with religious instruction, the teacher is to put up and keep up the same notification.

4. When the regular instruction proceeds the religious instruction, in any National school, there shall be a sufficient interval between the commencement and the commencement of the religious instruction, and whether the religious or the secular instruction shall have priority in any National school, the books used for the instruction first to be read shall be laid aside at its termination, in the given or other place appropriated for keeping the school books.

5. No secular instruction, whether literary or industrial, shall be carried on in the same apartment, during school hours,\* simultaneously with religious instruction.

6. In schools towards the building of which the State has contributed, and which are vested in trustees, for the purposes of National education, or which are vested in the Commissioners in their corporate capacity, such persons or other persons as shall be approved of by the parents or guardians of the children respectively, shall have access to them in the school-room, for the purpose of giving them religious instruction there, at times convenient for that purpose—that is, times so appointed as not to interfere unduly with the other arrangements of the school.

7. The reading of the Scriptures, either in the Protestant Authorized or Douay Version,—the teaching of Catechisms,—public power,—and all other religious exercises, must conform to the rules as to religious instruction.

8. The parents and managers of all National schools have the right to permit the Holy Scriptures, either in the Authorized or Douay Version, to be read at the time or times set apart for religious instruction, and in all such schools the parents or guardians of the children have the right to require the parents and managers to afford opportunities for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, in the school-room, under proper persons approved of by the parents or guardians for that purpose.

9. Religious instruction, prayer, or other religious exercises, may take place, at any time, before and after the ordinary school business (during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend), but must not take place at more than one intermediate time, between the commencement and the close of the ordinary school business. The Commissioners, however, will not sanction any arrangement for religious instruction, prayer, or other religious exercises, of an intermediate time in cases where it shall appear to them that such arrangement will interfere with the usefulness of the school, by preventing children of any religious denomination from availing themselves of its advantages, or by subjecting those in attendance to any practical inconvenience.

10. With the above exception the secular school business must not be interrupted, or suspended, by any spiritual exercise, whatsoever.

*Note.*—The Commissioners expressly recommend that religious instruction shall take place either immediately before the commencement, or immediately after the close of the ordinary school business, and they further recommend that, whenever the parents or managers think fit to have religious instruction at an intermediate time, a separate apartment, shall (when practicable) be provided for the reception of those children whose parents or guardians may disapprove of their being present there.

11. The register kept in each school, according to the form provided by the Commissioners, must show the religious denomination of each child on the school roll.

12. No pupil who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Protestant is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction, in case the teacher giving such instruction is a Roman Catholic; and no pupil who is registered by its parents or guardians as a Roman Catholic is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction, in case the teacher giving such instruction is not a Roman Catholic. And further, no pupil is to be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of any religious instruction to which its parents or guardians object.

Provided, however, that in case any parent or guardian shall express his desire that his child should receive any particular religious instruction, and shall record such desire in a book to be provided in the school, when necessary, for

that purpose, this prohibition shall not apply to the time during which such religious instruction only is given. The entry in the book shall be signed with the name or mark of the parent or guardian, and the book shall be submitted to the Inspector or other as he visits the school.

13. A sufficient number of books, to be approved of in each case by the Commissioners, is to be appropriated to the ordinary school business during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend.

14. In all National schools (except those in which industrial instruction is the chief object) there must be literary instruction for at least four hours upon five days in the week.

15. In industrial schools—that is, in schools where industrial instruction is the chief object—the Commissioners require that no less than two hours daily shall be devoted to literary instruction.

16.—1. The use of the books published by the Commissioners is not compulsory; but the titles of all other books which the parents or managers of schools intended for the ordinary school business, are to be notified to the Commissioners; and none are to be used to which they object. The approval of any such books is to extend only to the particular edition which has been submitted to the Commissioners.

2. If any books other than the Holy Scriptures, or the standard books of the Church to which the children sing their hymns, be employed in communicating religious instruction, the title of such a book is to be notified to the Commissioners whenever they deem it necessary.

3. The Commissioners do not object to the "Singles Lesson" or book of "Singles Poetry" being read in any of the National schools, or do they object to them to be read as part of the ordinary school business (during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend) in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to their being read by their children.

In such cases the Commissioners prohibit the use of such books, except at times set apart for the purpose, either before or after such ordinary school business, and under the following conditions:

First.—That no child, whose parent or guardian objects, shall be required, directly or indirectly, to be present at such reading.

Second.—That in order that any children, whose parents or guardians object may be able to absent themselves, or to withdraw, at the time set apart for the reading of the books above specified, public notification of the time set apart for such reading shall be inserted in large letters in the time-table of the school—that there shall be a sufficient interval between the conclusion of such ordinary school business and the commencement of such reading; and that the teacher shall, immediately before its commencement, announce distinctly to the pupils that any child whose parent or guardian so desires may then retire.

Third.—That in any such case there shall be, on every day of the time set apart for such reading, sufficient time devoted each day to the ordinary school business, in order that those children who do not join in the reading of those books may enjoy ample means of literary instruction in the school hours.

4. When using the Scripture lessons, the teachers are prohibited, except at the times set apart for religious instruction, from putting to the children any other questions than those appended to the end of each lesson.

5. The Commissioners require that the principles of the following laws, as of a lesson of a similar import (to be approved of by the Commissioners), shall be strictly inculcated, during the hours of stated instruction, in all schools received into connexion with the Board, and that a copy of the lesson itself be hung up in each school:

Christians should embrace, as the apostle Paul commands, that which is good, with all men (Rom. xii. 9, 10), even with those of a different religious persuasion.

Our Saviour, Christ, commanded his disciples to love one another. He taught them to love even their enemies, to bless those that cursed them, and to pray for those who persecuted them. He himself prayed for his murderers.

Many men hold erroneous doctrines, but we ought not to hate or persecute them. We ought to hold fast what we are commanded in the truth, but not to fight harshly those who are in error. Jesus Christ did not send his disciples to be feared, but to give by violent means. He would not allow his disciples to fight for him.

If any person treat us unkindly, we must not do the same to them, for Christ and his apostles have taught us not to reward evil

\* *Note.*—The term "School Hours" is always to be understood to mean the entire time, in each day, from the opening of the school to the closing of the same, for the dismissal of the pupils.

† Such expression of desire may at any time be revoked by the parents or guardians, and shall thereupon become inoperative.

for self. If we would obey Christ, we must do so where, and as they do so at first as we would wish them to do so.

Questioning with our neighbors and showing them, is not the way to convince them that we are in the right and they in the wrong. It is more likely to convince them that we have not a Christian spirit. We ought, by believing gently and kindly to every one, to show ourselves followers of Christ, who, when he was reviled, reviled not again. (1 Pet. ii. 2, v. 22).

6. The use of the tablet furnished by the Commissioners, containing the Ten Commandments, is not compulsory.

7. The rules as to religious instruction do not apply, except in the way heretofore stated, to the Scripture lessons, and the Book of Sacred Poetry, or to the matters contained in the common school-books, or in any other book the use of which the Commissioners may at any time sanction for the purpose of united instruction.

§ VI.—12. The local patron (or managers) of schools have the right of appointing the teachers, subject to the approval of the Board as to character and general qualifications; the local patron (or managers) have also the power of removing the teachers of their own authority.

§ VIII.—1. The public generally must have free access to every National school (whether vested or non-vested) during the hours devoted to secular instruction,—not to take part in the ordinary business, or to interrupt it, but as visitors, to observe how it is conducted.

2. Visitors of all denominations are to be received courteously by all teachers of National schools, and are to have free access to the school-rooms, and full liberty to examine the Register, Daily Report Books, and Class Roll; to observe what books are in the hands of the children, or upon

the desks, what exhibits are hung up on the walls, and what is the method of teaching; but they are not authorized to interrupt the business of the school, by asking questions of the children, examining classes, calling for papers or documents of any kind, except those specified, or in any other way diverting the attention of other teachers or scholars from their usual business.

3. The Commissioners require that a copy of PART I., with selections from other parts of them, their rules, on a form furnished by them, shall be suspended in every National school-room.

## PART IV.

§ I.—2 No clergyman of any denomination, or member of any religious order, can be recognized as the teacher of a National school. This does not apply to the teachers of voluntary schools, nor to those of any voluntary schools which have been at any time previously in connexion with the Board.

3. Should the Commissioners consider any teacher in a vested school unfit for his office, or otherwise objectionable, they will require that he be dismissed and another provided; in non-vested schools the grant of salary will be withheld until a suitable teacher be procured. Teachers are also liable to be fined, deposed, or suspended, at all times, when the Commissioners shall deem it necessary, on sufficient cause being shown.

Office of National Education,  
186

} Secretary

## APPENDIX No. IV.

## CODE OF INSTRUCTIONS FOR DISTRICT AND SUB-INSPECTORS.

[See Question 1103, page 43.—Mr. Keanan's Evidence.]

I. The year is to be divided into three terms, during each of which fourteen weeks at least must be given, irrespective of all other work, and of vacations, &c., to the effective inspection of schools, and in each week the first five days are to be so employed. The terms are to commence, respectively, on the 1st of January, 1st of May, and 1st of September.

II. From four to five hours, at least, exclusive of the time occupied in going to and returning home from the schools, are to be spent, on the average, each day in the actual inspection of schools; but when two schools are inspected on the same day, the time spent in passing from one to the other will be accepted as accounting for part of the above minimum.

III. Each Inspector will be required to visit and report on all the schools in his district once in each term.

IV. When, however, from unavoidable causes—and such must be clearly accounted for—the Inspector shall not be able to complete his inspection of all the schools within the term, he is, in the succeeding term, to visit those first which may have been so left in arrears. Any departure from this rule will be regarded as a serious neglect of duty.

V. The Inspector is not to visit schools during the ordinary vacations, or on any specified holidays. In connexion with this, the Inspector is required to make himself particularly acquainted, in the case of every school in his charge, with the days alluded to, and to see that they are specified in the Time Table. The names of the holidays need not be entered, their dates alone will suffice.

He is also to direct that when schools shall be closed, from any cause whatever, at times other than those specified in the Time Table, he shall have such previous notice of the same given him by the teacher as may prevent him from misemploying his time in visiting the school.

VI. Should it, however, happen that a school is unexpectedly closed at the time of the Inspector's visit, he is required to give an answer to all such queries as can be answered under the circumstances; and as is also expected, if another school be within a reasonable distance, to visit and report upon it in the usual way.

VII. The forms of report are herewith to be distinguished into primary and secondary. On the first

form, the primary, each school is to be reported on once in each year; and on the second, the two remaining reports are to be made. In the case of new schools, the first report on them, after becoming National, should be made on the primary form.

VIII. The reports upon one-third of the schools in each term are to be made on the primary form, and the remaining two-thirds on the secondary.

IX. When intending to report on a school on the primary form—and such should never be used except the school is found in operation—the Inspector is to give due previous notice of the time of his visit; but in other cases he is not to give such previous notice, and the practice of notifying the day of inspection throughout the entire of the middle term of the year is to be given up.

X. With the exception of the case above stated, the Inspector is to take care to visit schools as unobtrusively as possible; and with this view he should so arrange his course of inspection as not to remain, when from home, too long in the same locality, or to repeat his visits to schools in the same neighborhood or group in too immediate succession.

XI. As many abuses may be prevented or corrected by incidental visits to schools, the Inspectors are required to make as many such as possible, and in every case, after having ascertained whether former suggestions have been attended to, and evils previously pointed out corrected, to leave an entry of such visit in the Report Book, and record it under the head, *Incidental visit*, in his weekly diary, accompanied, if necessary, by a special letter, in case of anything of pressing importance having come under his notice.

XII. When two schools are in the same house, or immediately contiguous, the Inspector should not defer visiting the second until he have completed his examination of the first, but should pass rapidly from the one to the other, remaining in, or returning afterwards to the one he means first to examine.

XIII. When called upon to report on applicant schools the Inspector is not to give previous notice of the time of his inspection, but in every case, after making such exceptions, he is to seek an interview with the manager or applicant; and in no instance is he to forward his reports upon such schools until he shall have allowed sufficient time to the local clergy

S. A.

APPENDIX,  
No. 4.

APPENDIX,  
No. 4.

and others concerned to reply to his communications regarding the propriety or non-propriety of the Board's entertaining the application.

XIV. In the case of applicant schools already in operation, the Inspector is to carefully examine the teacher, and chiefly by written exercises, especially in arithmetic, geography, and penmanship; and these exercises together with, in every case, one in writing from dictation, he should carefully preserve for after reference.

Such schools, to be entitled to favourable consideration, the Inspector is ever to remember, should, among other things be found—

1st. Well disposed as to site.

2nd. To have premises clean and neat.

3rd. To have house well and substantially built; the walls plastered inside, the floor even, and free from damp; a suitable fire-place and flannel, the windows sufficient in number, of proper size and structure, and fitted to ensure thorough ventilation.

4th. To have the furniture suitable and adequate, including desks and forms for pupils; book-press; black board, a desk with seat for teacher; rails or lesson posts for suspension of reading and other tablets, &c., and be prepared to purchase a clock, and at least one large map, that of the world, and a supply of books, stationery, and other school requisites, for sale to pupils at reduced prices.

5th. To afford satisfactory evidence of the promise of sufficient average attendance, and that without depending on or interfering with the attendance on other National schools in the neighbourhood already established, and in successful operation.

XV.—Teachers to be eligible for admission into the service of the Board should, if males, have completed their seventeenth year, and if females, their sixteenth. They should be persons of Christian sentiment, and of unexceptional moral character, and free from such physical or other defects as would in any way interfere with their usefulness.

XVI. On entering a National school with a view to its inspection, and after having introduced himself to the teacher, if a stranger, or otherwise suitably addressed him, if known—*which should be his first duty*—the Inspector ought immediately to direct himself to observe whether the fundamental regulations of the Board are complied with, as regards—

A. 1st. The use of the movable “tablet” intended to notify the species of instruction at any time being given, whether religious or secular.

2nd. The Commissioners’ rules, whether a copy is suspended in school-room for the perusal of visitors.

3rd. The Time Table, whether the religious instruction, if any, given in the school, is properly specified therein, both as to its time and general nature, and if the practice of the school is actually conformable to such notification. By general nature of religious instruction is simply meant, whether it is catechetical, or scriptural, or both, &c., &c. If the religious instruction happens to be going on at time of Inspector’s visit, he is so to interfere with, or take part in it, but merely to observe that no other business, literary or industrial, is carried on concurrently with it, and he may employ himself usefully meanwhile also, in examining the school accounts, &c.

4th. The use of books, whether they are in all cases, when intended for secular instruction, such as are authorized by the Board, and whether those for religious instruction are read by the children at the proper times only.

5th. Whether the *General Lesson*, or a lesson of similar import, is read and the principles inculcated at the time of combined ordinary instruction.

B. 1st. He is to observe whether the business which is going on when he enters corresponds with that assigned to that particular hour on the Time Table; and generally, with regard to this last document, which is meant to embody the law of the school, he ought to see whether the course of instruction set forth therein is judiciously arranged, and, above all, whether the arrangements which it indicates are really carried out in practice.

2nd. The Inspector should then proceed to examine the school accounts, namely, the Cash Book, Report Book, and Register, beginning with the first, and comparing the entries of these respective records one with the other; and in any case where he has reason to suspect unfairness or incorrectness, he is to adopt the most effective means in his power compatible with the decency due to the teacher, and his position in relation to the children, to ascertain the nature and amount of the irregularity, and afterwards record the particulars in his report, taking care, however, to distinguish more infirmity, want of punctuality, omission, or neglect, from deliberate or designed falsification.

3rd. The Inspector is next to obtain the information required for the more purely statistical part of his report, as the number of pupils present in each class, or learning each subject; their ages, the supply of books and other requisites; the state of the free stock; the amount and sources of the incomes of the teachers, assistants, &c.; the state of repair of the house and school offices; the condition of the premises, &c., &c. No school can be regarded as well supplied with books and requisites except one whose pupils are provided with the books of their respective classes, and where, in addition, there is a sufficient safe stock on hand to meet the current wants consequent on admission of new pupils or changes of classification.

4th. When all business of this preliminary nature shall have been completed, the Inspector will then enter on the more important part of his duty, which is the examination of the school as to its educational condition.

XVII. In examining the pupils, and afterwards when recording his opinions and remarks in the Observation Book, the Inspector is to have constant reference and regard to the *School Progresses* as to the branches to be taught, and the degree of proficiency to be attained in the respective classes, and in connection with the several reading lesson books.

XVIII. In whatever order he may choose to examine the classes of the school, whether beginning with the lower and proceeding upwards to the higher, or the reverse—and either of these courses may be adopted with propriety according to circumstances and the different objects in view—the Inspector should be careful never to close his inspection without inquiring into the state and proficiency of the *junior pupils*.

XIX. In regard to some subjects, as grammar, geography, arithmetic, writing from dictation, geometry, construction, algebra, &c., the Inspector may usefully examine, collectively, all the pupils learning such branches, beginning with the first principles and simpler elements, and proceeding upwards to the higher, setting aside the younger and less proficient pupils who advance from stage to stage, and retaining the more forward for further examination.

XX. In forming a final judgment on the state of a school, the Inspector, at each inspection, should, besides other points which may occur to him, have principally regard to—

1st. The material state and general keeping of the entire establishment.

2nd. The moral character of the school.

3rd. The course of instruction given in it and the methods and processes of teaching employed.

4th. Whether the pupils are suitably chosen according to their ages and capacities, and are taught such things, and have attained such proficiency, as is their circumstances they ought to be taught and to have attained.

5th. Whether the teachers are competent, efficient, and influential; faithful in the observance of all suggestions left for their guidance, prompt in the correction of abuses, and eager for improvement; duly impressed with the importance of their office, and earnest and content in the discharge of its duties.

6th. Whether the whole or all aspects of the school, and the tone and spirit pervading it be satisfactory or the reverse; and whether the bearing, language, and manners of the teacher, his command over his pupils,

and their deportment towards him, he such as ought to be observed.

XX. Whether admission to the combined general instruction given in the school, and upon which alone, consistently with the rules of the Board, attendance may be required, is open to all children whatever, without any conditions as to their attendance on the religious instruction given in it, in other words, whether the combined general instruction is so open to all, that access to it is in no way made dependent on the observance of any rule whatsoever not obviously and legitimately providing for the proper carrying out of such combined general instruction and the ordinary discipline of the school.

XXI. In addition to the Time Table, which is intended merely to indicate the general arrangements of the school, and the great divisions of its teaching, the Inspector should see that the teachers are provided with a programme of study for each class, drawn up by themselves, and indicating the exercises for each week and day; and he should further see that the time given in such programme to each subject or branch of instruction, is sufficient and proportioned to its relative importance, and that the teacher in all the exercises specified for each class, conforms to the rules set down by him in his programme.

XXII. It should be the duty also of the teachers to prepare beforehand notes or books of lessons on the lessons or subjects to be taught by them each day; and when this practice is not observed, the Inspector should recommend its introduction, and if necessary, furnish the teachers with instructions how to carry it out.

XXIII. In the case of infant schools, the Inspector should see that the instruction is given with the necessary prudence and sobriety of mind, being suitably proportioned to the tender faculties of infancy, and accompanied at proper intervals with physical exercises and song; and, generally speaking, that the course is limited to the first and most simple elements of reading and writing, to the knowledge of forms and colours, with easy exercises on the arithmetic, and some notions, but of an entirely obvious and popular kind, of geography and natural history, and the more common kinds and arts of life. The teachers of such schools should be directed by the Inspector to look carefully after the kind of food the children may bring with them for their refreshment, to provide them with pure drinking water, and look particularly to the cleanliness of their clothes and persons.

XXIV. Inspectors are expected to keep themselves at all times fully provided with the gratuitous requisites or official forms for schools, as Class Rolls, Time Tables, General Lessons, &c., and to supply them readily and at once whenever they may see them wanted.

XXV. In every instance where, in the case of an ordinary National school, the Inspector observes any violation of rule, or existing defect, he is to suggest to the manager or teacher the necessity of its correction, and state in his report that he has done so, explaining further in what manner and with what spirit his suggestions have been received.

XXVI. Whenever observations or suggestions the Inspector may think it his duty to make in the Observation Book he should send over at the close of his inspection to the teacher, and so explain as to make them fully understood.

XXVII. On entering a district, and during the course of his first term of inspection, the Inspector is to seek to make himself acquainted with the managers or correspondents, and on all subsequent occasions to call upon them regarding any matters of importance that may come under his notice in their schools.

When managers are not at home, the Inspector should leave his card to intimate the fact of his visit.

XXVIII. In cases where a dismissed teacher still holds possession of a school, the Inspector is not to examine the children, or enter into the minute details of a full inspection, but merely to report upon its general state, the condition of the free stock and other public property in possession.

XXIX. When inquiring into the state of the

supply of books, &c., the Inspector should be careful in examining the lists of stock obtained at reduced prices, to see that no abuses are committed by local parties obtaining unduly requisites intended for the school and its pupils only.

XXX. The Inspector is not to make any entry in the Report Book, except the date of his visit, the time occupied by him in inspection, stating the hour at which it commenced and that at which it closed, with the number of pupils present. Should there appear any observations in the Report Book worthy of notice, by whomsoever made, he is to transcribe them into his Note Book and forward them in his report to the office.

XXXI. The Inspector is not to omit visiting any school on his district book in consequence of hearing reports that it has been closed, or withdrawn from its connexion with the Board, but must go to the place and make inquiry into the circumstances, that he may afterwards report them correctly for the information of the Commissioners.

XXXII. He is to bear in mind that he is not an administrator or authoritative director of the National system of education, but simply and essentially an Inspector of its schools, and that as such, his chief duty in reference thereto is to place before the Commissioners in clear, faithful, and comprehensive reports, the means by which they may interfere usefully and effectively for the improvement of the schools placed in connexion with them. He is not, therefore, to give direct orders as on the part of the Board, requesting any necessary regulations, much less is he to alter on his own authority any regulations already in existence, but make such suggestions to the patrons and teachers as he may think proper for the correction of observed abuses, the supply of existing wants, or for the improvement of the organization and management of the schools.

XXXIII. When the Inspector visits with a view to his primary report, he should himself examine all the classes in the several subjects taught there, in order to make an accurate and full return of their several stages of proficiency; but on the remaining visits, it is desirable, to enable him to judge fully of the teacher's merits as a schoolkeeper and instructor of youth, that he should forego the personal examination of all the classes, but rather instead, call upon the teacher himself to examine the pupils of some classes, and in a few subjects, and put the school through its usual routine order of business as his province.

XXXIV. In all his intercourse with the teachers, the Inspector is to treat them with the most perfect kindness and respect, counselling them privately on whatever he may see defective or faulty, but by no means addressing them authoritatively, or commanding on their conduct in the hearing of their pupils, to whom also, in their turn he is to exhibit a considerate and affectionate manner, and who are always to be addressed by him in language of the truest courtesy and propriety. He should surely take care to preserve himself from such peevishness, harshness, or abruptness, in his communications with the children, as if observed by him in the teacher it would be his duty not only to notice, but as a serious fault to deplore and correct.

XXXV. The Inspector, without seeming obnoxious, unbecomingly interfering, or too much curious, should so far as possible inform himself of the general character borne by the teachers in his district, the estimation in which they are held by the people of their locality, their social position, and their conduct as members of society.

XXXVI. The Inspector is to receive a quarterly report from the teacher of each National school in his district, and is also himself to make one annually to the Commissioners. Forms for both these reports can be had by applying to the office, and from their personal nature of their returns and information required, will be at once seen.

XXXVII. The Inspector will be required, at the close of each term, to forward to the office, on the required printed form, a return of the public duty of all kinds performed by him within the term.

APPENDIX.  
No. 4.

XXXVIII. A book, known as the District Book, and which is substituted for the old "Road Book," is to be kept by the Inspector, who is required to record therein from time to time as he proceeds with his inspection, all matters of importance regarding each school in his charge.

XXXIX. The Inspector is likewise to keep a "Note Book" of the form supplied by the Board, and in which he is to enter at each separate visit to a school all the details of his inspection; and thus he is to do in so full a manner that such writings may be afterwards taken as a faithful record of the report subsequently forwarded by him to the office.

XL. A "Guard Book," is also required to be kept by the Inspector for the preservation of all official letters, Boards' orders, and other communications relating to his public duties.

XLI. As it is the desire of the Commissioners that the Head Inspectors in their tours of inspection through the circuits of districts placed in their charge, should examine the documents referred to in paragraphs XXXVII., XXXVIII., XXXIX., and XL., and if necessary report to the Board upon the manner in which they are kept, it will be the duty of the District Inspectors to have them always in readiness for examination, and in a state fully reflecting the work done by them each week up to the time they may be called for.

XLII. The Commissioners require that, except in the case of sickness or some other unavoidable calamity the Inspector shall have forwarded to the office, so as to reach it not later than each successive Monday morning, his diary for the previous week, together with the reports on the National schools visited by him during the same period. He is also expected to observe the same punctuality in his general correspondence with the office, excepting only those cases where the interests of the public service may demand some further delay.

XLIII. When Inspectors remain away on duty from their allotted centres for more than one or two days, they should leave instructions behind to have their official letters duly forwarded to them. An Inspector is not to leave his district, except when called upon to do so on business of the Board, or without having previously obtained permission from the office.

XLIV. 1st. The Commissioners direct that Inspectors shall on no account summon teachers already classed for further promotion, whose schools are not in every respect satisfactory, but more particularly as regards the nature and amount of the instruction imparted to them and the proficiency of their pupils, their average attendance, and their general character for the observance of order and cleanliness, and for order in all the arrangements of their schools, and who are not themselves, moreover, distinguished by the thoughtfulness, earnestness, and zeal with which they devote themselves to their duty.

2nd. Teachers whom the Inspector intends to recommend for the training class in Dublin should have notice given them, at least six months previously, of such his intention, in order that they may have full opportunity to prepare themselves for passing the entrance examination to a manner at once creditable to themselves and satisfactory to the professors. The course required for entrance is that prescribed in the official programme for third class teachers, with the addition, in the case of male teachers, of the elements of geometry; and on this course it is expected the Inspector shall carefully examine each of the teachers whom he may propose to recommend before making the usual return to the office; for he is to remember, that should any of those whose names he may send in be found, on examination by the professors, inadequately prepared on the above entrance or preparatory course, they will be refused admittance into the training class, and be obliged to return to their schools.

3rd. None are to be selected who have been previously trained, or who are labouring under any physical defect, or who are not in the full enjoyment of sound health, or incapable of walking with ease and

from Glamorgan. Those under thirty years of age should have the preference.

XLV. The Inspector is expected to make inquiries respecting the general state of education in the neighbourhoods he visits, the disposition of the people to receive instruction, and the merits or defects of that given in such schools within their reach as may not be in connexion with the Board.

XLVI. 1st. Each Inspector is required to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the fundamental principles of the National System of Education, the rules of the Board, and the general history and progress of its administration from its origin to the present time.

2nd. It is also expected of him that he should not only study to strengthen and enlarge his knowledge of the different branches of literature, philosophy, and science connected with or bearing on the duties of his office, but that he should likewise make himself familiar with the state of popular education at home and in other countries, and also seek to acquire, and, as opportunity offers, keep up and improve, acquaintance with the opinions and writings of the eminent educationalists of the time.

XLVII. The Commissioners make no rule against the Inspectors walking to the schools, but they think it more becoming and more consistent of the public trust that they should drive to and from the schools (except for very short distances), and with this view they require that each Inspector shall provide, and keep himself provided, with a horse.

XLVIII. The Inspector is to avoid all polemical discussions of a religious or political nature; and, in his public capacity, at the same time that he is to discharge his duty impartially and unemotionally, and irrespective of all local interests or party influences of whatever kind, he is to exhibit a courteous and conciliatory demeanour towards all persons with whom he is called upon to communicate, and in his intercourse with the schools to pursue such a line of conduct as will tend to uphold the just authority of both managers and teachers, while in his private life, and in all social relations as a member of the community in which he moves, he is required to support in a modest but becoming manner, the bearing, character, and standing of a gentleman, and scrupulously to avoid everything calculated in any degree to lessen the respectability of his position, or detract from the influence of his office.

XLIX. 1st. In all his correspondence with the office, whether employed in drawing up his ordinary reports, or making out returns of whatever kind, even those according to the most routine and common-place sort, the Inspector is to study to express himself with clearness, propriety, and precision, and to habituate himself to a style of penmanship at once neat, well-defined, and entirely legible.

2nd. Except in the case of schools not found in operation, every question in the report sheet, whether an appendix or National schools, should, as a general rule, have set down opposite to it, with whatever brevity expressed, a distinct, categorical reply, and all slovenly and inelegant abbreviations, headings, and dashes, should be carefully avoided. For, by leaving a question without an answer not clearly implied in a previous one, the examiner of the report may be often in doubt as to the fact referred to in the question, or whether the omission of a reply is owing to a simple oversight on the part of the reporter or to his supposing the answer inferable from a previous one, and that when perhaps it is not, or at least not clearly so.

3rd. Inspectors are expected to treat as confidential the letters addressed to them from the office, particularly those relating to cases of special inquiry, to the conduct of managers and patrons, or to the education or depression of teachers; nor are they, in any case, to give publicity to the contents of such communications, any further than their nature and purport obviously demand.

4. The Inspectors are further required to comply with the following directions, in their correspondence with the office:—

ask. All communications for which printed forms are not supplied are to be made on paper of foolscap size.

2nd. Should the communication relate to a school, the name of such school, with that of the county in which it is situated, to be stated at the head of the letter, as also the name and address of the manager, and the name of the teacher.

3rd. If the communication does not relate to any particular school, the subject of it, whatever it may be, should be set forth briefly, if practicable, at the head of the letter.

4th. Different subjects are not to be entered upon in the same communication, but each is to have a separate letter.

5th. The rank (whether "Sub" or "District Inspector") is to be added after the writer's signature, and also the number of the district of which he is in charge, or to which he may be attached.

6th. The word "Inspection" to be written, in large letters, in the left hand corner at bottom of the outside cover of all communications to the office.

7th. All communications, not too bulky for such mode of conveyance, to be transmitted through the regular channel of the Post Office, and properly enclosed in suitable envelopes.

8th. All communications to be addressed to the Secretaries.

9th. Inspectors are, as much as possible, except in the regular way of reporting, to avoid making themselves the channel of communication between managers of schools or others and the public.

10th. Whosoever applications for aid or notices of change of managers or teachers are addressed to Inspectors, they are to acquaint the writers that such communications must be addressed to the "Secretaries."

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO INSPECTORS IN CHARGE OF DISTRICT MODEL SCHOOLS.

LI. Where a district model school is placed in charge of an Inspector, he is expected, besides his stated and ordinary visits to pay as many occasional or accidental calls as in his power, and such at all times of the day, as well during the ordinary school hours, as both before and after, in order that he may see not only that the principal teachers and their several assistants are observant of the rules of the institution as regards the employment of their time and the prosecution of their studies, but how also the domestic arrangements are carried out.

LII. Instead of a weekly inspection of these institutions, as at present, three inspections in the term—each, however, to be separately reported on the form prescribed—will in future suffice; but, those inspections, it is to be distinctly understood, are to be of a serious and searching character; and with the view of making them truly such, the Inspector, instead of examining in detail all departments at each of these visits, should take them in succession, without, however, at any visit, neglecting to require into, and report on the attendance and classification of pupils in the others, and the general state of the whole establishment.

The teachers will still be required to furnish weekly returns of the attendance, &c., of the pupils, and these the Inspector, who will attend each Saturday at the model school to receive them, after having checked and corroborated, will forward to the office.

LIII. In recommending the appointment of pupil-teachers and monitors, who in every case should, before their selection, have been carefully examined by the Head or District Inspector, or by both, the Christian and surname, age, and religious denomination of each candidate, and also of the party causing the vacancy, are to be stated in full. The recommendation to be made on the printed form provided for the purpose, and signed by the Head and District Inspectors. A return showing the denomination, &c., of the pupil-teachers or monitors already in the school, is to accompany each recommendation.

LIV. The periods for appointments are to be so regulated, as that there shall always be in the school a sufficient number well acquainted with its discipline and the nature of the duties to be discharged.

LIV. All appointments are to date from the first of the month, to secure the strict observance of this rule, the Inspectors should be careful to forward their recommendations a sufficient time beforehand to allow of the Board's sanction being duly obtained, and in no case are they to admit the persons recommended by them into these institutions without having first obtained the authority of the Board.

An allowance, temporarily sanctioned, at the rate of £30 per annum, is made to the head master for the board and washing of each pupil-teacher, and for the assistant master when boarded by the Commissioners.

Where there is an agricultural department in connection with the district model schools, the Commissioners make a similar allowance to the head master for each five agricultural boarding pupil, and for the agricultural when boarded by the Commissioners. Paying agricultural pupils are required to pay the head master, quarterly, and in advance, at the rate of 6s per annum towards their board and washing, the Commissioners likewise paying at the rate of £12.

A monthly return is to be made out by the head master of the number of days each pupil-teacher and agricultural pupil has been boarded to the school, the return is to be signed by the master and Inspector, and forwarded within one week after the end of the month.

The Inspector is not to permit the name of any pupil-teacher, or agricultural pupil, to be included in the return, the approval of whose appointment by the Commissioners has not been notified to him from this office.

LVI. The parties selected for the office of pupil-teacher should, in no case, be under sixteen, nor above twenty years of age, and each should be provided with the following outfit—

2 Sets of Clothes.	6 Pocket-handkerchiefs.
2 Night Shirts.	2 Pair of Shoes.
6 Day Shirts.	1 Pair of Slippers.
6 Pairs of Socks or Stockings.	Haircomb, Hairbrush, and Toothbrush.
4 Neckties.	

LVII. Candidates for the office of paid monitor in model schools should not be under fourteen, nor over sixteen years of age.

LVIII. Both pupil-teachers and paid monitors should be of a sound and healthy constitution, and free from any physical defect likely to impair their efficiency as teachers.

LIX. Candidates for the office of paid monitor are to be examined, before appointment, on the course prescribed for the monitors of the ordinary National school.

LX. Candidates for the office of pupil-teacher should be required—

1. To read with ease and expression, and to have some knowledge of the principles of elocution, as explained in the first part of the Introduction to the Art of Reading.

2. To write out with correct spelling and punctuation, the substance of a short lesson selected from any of our lesson books, and read slowly to them twice over.

3. To write a good current hand, and be competent to superintend the writing of the junior classes.

4. To parse and analyze any passage selected from the National lesson books.

5. To know the general geography of the great divisions of the globe, and be familiar with the principles of mathematical and physical geography.

6. To exhibit readiness in mental calculation; to solve questions in compound proportion, fractions, and commercial arithmetic, and be familiar with the principles involved in the rules and processes employed by them. The girls will not be examined beyond interest.

7. To be acquainted with the prefixes and affixes of our own language, and the principal Greek and Latin roots.

8. To be able to examine, with a fair degree of effi-

Appendix,  
No. 4.

ciency, on any reading lesson selected, children of the third class, and competent to teach the rudiments of arithmetic to the junior pupils.

9. To know the first four sets contained in the Board's Treatise on Book-keeping.

10. To know the First and Second Books of Geometry with the exercises thereon, as given in Thompson's edition of Euclid.

11. To be acquainted with the elementary rules of Algebra, and able to solve questions in simple equations.

12. To know the rules for the measurement of plane surfaces and the principles on which these rules depend.

13. The girls to be able to teach plain needlework, and to exhibit a fair degree of skill in the finer kinds of knitting and netting.

14. To be prepared for examination on the subjects treated of in—

Spelling Book Superseded ;  
Geography Generalized, first eight chapters ;  
Lessons on Money Matters ;  
"Lessons on Reasoning, 1st part ;  
National Lesson Books, to the 4th inclusive ;  
Fifth Lesson Book, 3rd, 4th, and 5th inclusive ;  
Agricultural Class Book.

The girls are not to be examined on the subjects marked with an asterisk (\*).

LXI. At the end of the first half-year of their course of training, the pupil-teachers should be again examined on all prescribed for candidates at entrance, and at the end of the second half-year, or completion of their first year of training, on the following in addition, viz. :  
Descriptive Geography, as contained in the Introduction to Geography ;

The remaining chapters in the Geography Generalized on Mathematical and Physical Geography, together with those on the Method of Teaching ;

Lessons on Reasoning, 2nd Part ;  
The Second Section of the Fifth Book of Lessons,  
The Third and Fourth Books of Euclid with the exercises thereon, as given in Thompson ;  
The Fourth and Sixth Sections of the Treatise on Measurement ;  
Invention and Evolution ;  
Halliwell's Grammar ;  
Dewey's Hints to Teachers ;  
The Introductions contained in the Book of Poetry.

At the end of the second half-year they should also be expected to have acquired a pleasing and useful elocution, and become thorough masters of a good style of penmanship.

LXII. The Inspector should examine both monitors and pupil-teachers as frequently as due attention to his other duties will permit, and in every case record and preserve full and accurate notes of the results of his examination.

LXIII. The quarterly account of school fees is to terminate with the last Saturday of the months of March, June, September, and December, respectively.

LXIV. The Commissioners' portion of the school fees is to be paid over to the Inspector by the teachers weekly, and remitted to this office at the end of each quarter, without any deduction whatever, and by a letter of credit in favour of the Secretaries if possible—otherwise by a post office order ; and the charge for remitting in either case is to be included in the account of expenses.

LXV. The account of the fees received in the quarter is to accompany the certificate, signed by the master and mistress, and certified by the Inspector.

LXVI. The Inspector will be furnished with a sum sufficient to meet the ordinary petty expenses for three months of the district model school under his superintendence.

LXVII. The Inspector is to transmit to the office the account, in duplicate, including all such expenses,

certified by himself, within one week after the expiration of each quarter. The quarters to terminate with the last day of the months of March, June, September, and December, respectively. When the account has been examined in the office, a remittance will be made to the Inspector for the exact amount, thus leaving the original advance as a permanent imprest against him.

LXVIII. The account is in all cases to be signed by the Inspector and by the master of the school, and by the mistresses of the female and infant schools, when expenditure is included relating to their respective departments.

LXIX. Expenditure amounting to the sum of £2 or upwards is not to be incurred, without special authority previously obtained from the office, except for ordinary school expenses.

LXX. Rates and taxes not being chargeable upon public institutions used solely for educational purposes, the Inspector is to require that the description of the premises upon which a tax is levied be particularized in the notice left by the collector, as well as the date when the rate was made, the valuation, and rate per pound. The notice, when examined with the Assessment Book, or, should it not be available, the Collector's Rate Book, and found to be correctly charged upon the holding of the Commissioners, is to be certified accordingly, and forwarded with the receipt in support of the charge in the quarterly account.

LXXI. When a charge is made for printing "school notices" or "circulars," &c., relating to the district model school, a copy of the notice or circular is to be attached to the printer's receipt and forwarded in support of the charge in the account.

LXXII. The sums paid weekly for "wasting schools" should appear in the account as a monthly total, as also other charges of a very small amount, so as to avoid unnecessary petty detail.

LXXIII. Vouchers written and receipted in ink are to be forwarded in support of every item of expenditure, properly signed, and numbered consecutively to correspond with the entry of the sums in the account.

LXXIV. Payments of £2 and upwards are to be supported by a stamped receipt, which is to be paid for by the party receiving payment.

LXXV. In cases where the party paid is unable to sign his name to the receipt, his name must be witnessed by a third person, whose signature is to appear upon the voucher.

LXXVI. Receipt forms to serve as vouchers for small payments may be obtained from the office on application, but these forms are not to be used in cases where various articles are purchased, for which "shop bills" in detail, properly receipted, are to be produced.

LXXVII. The following is the scale of salaries sanctioned for monitors in district model schools :—

Males		Females	
1st Year,	£6	1st Year,	£5
2nd "	8	2nd "	5
3rd "	10	3rd "	10
4th "	12	4th "	12

LXXVIII. The Inspector is to transmit to the office within one week after the end of each month a return of the monitors employed in the male, female, and infant schools. When male and female monitors are recognised, one return is to be used for both, which is to be signed by the master and mistresses, and by the Inspector.

LXXIX. The return is not to include the name of any monitor the approval of whose appointment by the Commissioners has not been notified to the Inspector from the office.

LXXX. Should a monitor be unavoidably absent through illness, a substitute may be appointed at a salary of a monitor of the first year, but the Inspector is not to continue to return the name of such substitute for payment for a longer period than two months without the previous sanction of the Commissioners.

\* When residence is granted to a teacher in addition to his salary, that portion of the district model school occupied by the teacher is chargeable with rates. Dormitories and rooms for pupil-teachers and agricultural pupils are not rateable. School premises are liable for one-half pound rate, which is recoverable from the landlord.



## LXXXI. The terms of service for—

Pupil-Teachers and Free Agricultural Pupils, . . .	1 year
Paying Agricultural Pupils, . . .	2 year.
Male and Female Monitor, . . .	4 "

The Inspector is not to allow the name of any party to be included in a return beyond the prescribed term, without having first obtained the sanction of the Commissioners.

LXXXII. Assistant masters, assistant mistresses, pupil-teachers, and agricultural pupils, in district model schools, are granted an allowance for travelling on first joining the school, and for going to and returning from their homes at the midsummer vacation. Pupil-teachers and agricultural pupils are also granted travelling allowance on leaving the school at the expiration of their term.

No allowance is granted for any distance less than ten miles.

The Inspector is to forward to the office the account of such expenses, accepted by the teachers and pupils, and certified by himself.

LXXXIII. The Inspector is to transmit to the office upon the 30th June, and 31st December, in each year, a return setting forth the additions made to the furniture, &c., during the preceeding six months,

made out on the form supplied for the purpose. The return is to be a copy of the registers of the additions in the inventory kept at the school, which are to be carefully noted as they occur. Should no changes have occurred, a *Nil* return is to be forwarded, signed by the Inspector.

LXXXIV. As the impact in the hands of the Inspector is only intended for petty expenses, a requisition is to be forwarded with each quarterly account, stating in detail the articles (hardware, furniture, house-linen, &c.) required; particularising those required to replace what have been worn out from what have not previously been in the school.

LXXXV. The following forms will be supplied to Inspectors, on application being made to the office. All accounts and returns, &c., to be furnished upon the office forms:—

Forms for Quarterly Accounts, originals and duplicates
" Monthly Boarding Accounts.
" " Accounts—Mounted Salaries.
" Allowances for Travelling.
" Recommending Appointments.
" Requisitions.
" Inventory of Furniture.
" Vouchers.

APPENDIX,  
No 4.

## APPENDIX No. V.

## MEMORANDUM as to INCONVENIENCES arising out of the USE of DIFFERENT EDITIONS of the SAME BOOK in the SAME CLASS.

APPENDIX,  
No 5.

(See question 1485, p. 63.—Mr. Keenan's Evidence.)

## Immediate.

Education Office, 20th March, 1868.

Sir,—You are requested to report with the least possible delay, the number of cases in which you found pupils of the same draft using different editions of the lesson-book of their class.

In each case you are to state the number of pupils

in the draft, the dates and numbers of the several editions in use by the pupils, the extent of the inconvenience of the arrangement to pupils and teachers, and the cause of such arrangement.

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

(Signed) JAMES KELLY, } SECRETARIES.  
WILLIAM H. NEWELL, }

## ABSTRACT of REPLIES to LESSON-BOOK CIRCULAR.

Inspector	Inspector District.	Number of cases where Pupils of the same Draft used different Editions	Extent of inconvenience caused thereby
1. J. Barrett, . . .	Letterkenny, . . .	Not noted, . . .	Not great.
2. C. W. Dwyer, . . .	Londonberry, . . .	Noted for 98 schools; 253 cases, . . .	Serious.
3. W. Bole, . . .	Colmaise, . . .	Not noted, . . .	None.
4. D. M. Wilson, . . .	Ballymena, . . .	Do not, . . .	Very great.
5. J. Kelly, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Not great.
6. E. Smith, . . .	Strabane, . . .	Do not, . . .	None.
7. E. Irvine, . . .	Maghera, . . .	Do not, . . .	None.
8. T. M. Egan, . . .	Belfast, North, . . .	Not up, . . .	—
9. J. Molloy, . . .	Belfast, South, . . .	Not noted, . . .	Not serious.
10. J. Macdonnell, . . .	Newtownards, . . .	Do not, . . .	Trifling.
11. D. J. Rowntree, Acting Inspector, . . .	Lurgan, . . .	Not up, . . .	—
12. R. Robinson, . . .	Sligo, . . .	Not noted, . . .	—
13. W. Hanly, . . .	Keshidiller, . . .	Do not, . . .	Very slight.
14. S. Adair, . . .	Omagh, . . .	Do not, . . .	Considerable.
15. J. Morrell, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Not great.
16. A. T. O'Connor, . . .	Armagh, . . .	Do not, . . .	—
17. W. Kennedy, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Not great.
18. F. Early, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.
19. D. C. Foster, . . .	Newry, . . .	Noted for 71 schools; 3,054 cases, . . .	Do not.
20. J. E. Wood, . . .	Belfast, . . .	Not noted, . . .	Serious.
21. W. A. Donovan, . . .	Swanford, . . .	Do not, . . .	Considerable.
22. J. W. Rodgers, . . .	Boyle, . . .	Do not, . . .	Not great.
23. H. M. Rodgers, . . .	Carrig, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.
24. A. J. Simpson, . . .	Ballykesh, . . .	Do not, . . .	Serious.
25. E. MacDonnell, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Not great.
26. W. Nicholls, . . .	Wexford, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.
27. J. M. Sweeney, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.
28. J. Bradford, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Very little.
29. E. A. Cowell, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Great.
30. E. Stacey, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.
31. H. Molloy, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Not great.
32. A. Cowley, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.
33. H. L. D'Arcy, . . .	Downpatrick, . . .	Do not, . . .	Do not.

Inspector	Inspection District.	Number of cases where Pupils of the same draft used different editions	Extent of inconvenience caused thereby
34. J. Gordon,	Galaxy,	Not noted,	Not great.
35. G. T. O'Neill,	Bellinzie,	Ditto,	Ditto.
36. S. Brown,	Parsonstown,	Ditto,	Serious.
37. G. H. O'Galligan,	Narr,	Noted for 41 schools,	Considerable.
38. P. F. O'Garra,	Dublin, South,	Not noted,	Not great.
39. M. Doyle,	Carlow,	Ditto,	Very great.
40. B. MacBridey,	Wicklow,	Ditto,	Considerable.
41. C. Graham,	Portlargo,	Ditto,	Not great.
42. W. Stapleton,	Gort,	Ditto,	Very great.
43. M. Lawlor,	Tarboro,	Ditto,	No inconvenience.
44. W. Moller,	Athy,	Ditto,	Not great.
45. D. O'Driscoll,	Ennis,	Ditto,	Ditto.
46. J. Rowse,	Tipperary,	Ditto,	Ditto.
47. L. Harkin,	Kilcomney,	Ditto,	Very little.
48. C. Mahony,	Youghal,	Ditto,	A positive advantage.
49. Yocant,	—	—	—
50. J. G. Fitzgerald,	Ennisceorthy,	Not noted,	Not great.
51. R. Patterson,	Limerick,	Ditto,	Ditto.
52. J. Harlan,	Newcastle, West,	Ditto,	Serious.
53. J. O'Hara,	Clonsilla,	Ditto,	Considerable.
54. J. C. Lane,	Trillick,	Ditto,	Not much.
55. T. K. Stang,	Marsboro,	Ditto,	Ditto.
56. C. W. Rossman,	Malboro,	Ditto,	Ditto.
57. T. Mammara,	Killarney,	Ditto,	Considerable.
58. M. Seymour,	Enniscorthy,	Noted for 39 schools—116 cases,	Not great.
59. P. Connelley,	Dunnamore,	Not noted,	Ditto.
60. J. Gally,	Corb,	Ditto,	Ditto.

Of the fifty-six replies received, only three show that any notes were taken by the Inspectors, but the cases observed have in all districts been numerous.

## Notes.

In the letters received from the District Inspectors, the chief evils resulting from the use of various editions are given thus—

1. No regular system of home lessons can be carried out.
2. There is difficulty in conducting collective class lessons.
3. The convenience of the children in classes, as the lesson-books, if impeded.
4. The preparation of teachers for their examination is made more troublesome.
5. The lesson which are not common to all the editions will frequently be omitted altogether.
6. Verbal alterations (often very small) in the same lesson prevent the teacher observing whether reading is accurate.
7. Approximation of further alterations is lost often after private purchase.

The difficulties according to most of the Inspectors appear to be rapidly passing away.

Mr. Graham, District 51, says, "The teachers clearly object to an inconvenience."

Mr. Mahony, District 48, considers that it is an advantage to have different editions of the same book in use in the same school.

## APPENDIX NO. VI

## CIRCULAR LETTER explanatory of the NATURE of SCHOOL ORGANIZATION, and the DUTIES of the ORGANIZERS and INSPECTORS in relation to it.

[See question 1647, page 73—Mr. KERRAN'S evidence.]

1. The objects which the Commissioners of National Education have had in view, in establishing the staff of organizers, are two-fold, viz—

A. To bring National schools into a state of efficiency.

B. To diffuse amongst the teachers of the country a knowledge of schoolmastership in all its practical bearings, and also of the leading principles of the science of education.

2. To carry out the first great object (A.) the organizers will devote themselves, during their stay in a school, to the following, as the main part of their duties—

3. To secure a regular and proper ventilation of the school-room.

4. To improve the lighting of the school-room, if necessary.

5. To make suitable arrangements as to the playground and out-offices.

6. To make every available use of the walls, to provide tablet-tables, &c.

7. To arrange maps, charts, and tablets, and show how they can be most profitably used.

8. To provide black boards, cards, pointers, arith metres, &c., and instruct the teachers as to their use.

9. To see that a sufficient number of desks is provided, that they are properly arranged and fixed on the floor, that provision is made for holding the slates,

and that the business legitimate to the desks is regularly carried on.

10. To secure sufficient space for the drafts, to deposit them by suitable marks on the floor, and to arrange the business proper to the drafts.

11. To classify the pupils, and divide them into convenient divisions and drafts.

12. To make out a time-table suitable to the circumstances of the school, and to test its judiciousness, by experiment, for a number of days before recommending its adoption to the manager.

13. To see that the pupils, as well as the teacher, understand the arrangements indicated in the time-table.

14. To establish a sound system of monitorial instruction; to see that the members of the monitor class are judiciously selected, that they are sufficiently mature and intelligent for their duties, that their employment as monitors does not interfere with their business as pupils; that they be required to teach those pupils only which they are competent to teach; that they receive special instruction from the teachers in less of the time spent by them in teaching; that the business arranged for their special instruction is regularly conducted; that they are instructed in the art of teaching; that they are taught to prepare notes of the lessons which they may be called upon to teach; that they know their duties prospectively; that they teach the same set of children from day to day for an assigned

time, that their teaching is effective, that the pupils have sufficient respect for them, and confidence in their abilities; that such arrangements are made as to satisfy the parents of pupils and monitor with the national system, and that the teacher is duly prepared to control and prepare the monitors for their duties.

15. Whilst national instruction, judiciously and moderately employed, is encouraged, the organizers are to see that all the *strengths* of the education of a child are looked after and cared for by the teacher himself, and that the latter is to be almost constantly employed in the actual teaching of class after class, at the same time that he exercises an active superintendence over all the simultaneous operations of his school.

16. To establish a system of home lessons; to make arrangements for their regular announcement day after day; to see that they are properly heard, that the answering of the pupils is in some form noted, and that the general order of such lessons be kept in correspondence with the ordinary teaching pursued in the school.

17. To arrange for the regular recapitulation or repetition of the home and other lessons.

18. To make arrangements that the parents may be constantly informed as to the attention of the children to the home lessons and general business of the school.

19. To exemplify before the teacher the different methods of teaching, and to cause him in turn to practice the same.

20. To see that he prepares "notes of lessons" in proper form, on the different subjects taught in the school, and that he teaches the various lessons in conformity with the notes so prepared.

21. To effect as much improvement as possible in the teaching of reading, writing, arithmetic, dictation, geography, drawing, &c., and particularly in the teaching of the *First Book*.

22. To see that the teacher gives clear evidence that he prepares himself beforehand for the work of each day, not only in the notes of the lessons which he is to teach, but also in the general business, including the simplest mechanical details of his school.

23. To drill the children, put them through the simple marching exercises, establish order and discipline, and train the teacher to continue the same course of drill and discipline as established.

24. To see that the business of the school is conducted with the least noise possible.

25. To establish a system of punishment for badly conducted children, and to introduce a system of censure or reward, to promote good conduct.

26. To improve the manners of the children, and to see that there is a daily inspection as to cleanliness, &c.

27. To see that the children are provided with the necessary books for home study, and that a sufficient stock, and an ample supply of school materials and requisites are furnished.

28. To arrange as to the selling of the rolls with all possible dispatch; to provide a report sheet; to correct and show the teacher how to keep the school accounts, and to cause scroll or rolls to be kept.

29. To adopt measures towards improving the attendance of the children, particularly with reference to punctuality in the morning.

30. Finally, the organizer is to lead the teacher into a strict observance of the rules of the Board, but especially the practical rules for teachers.

31. The Commissioners of National Education have decided that no National school can be organized until the manager express his desire to avail himself of the services of an organizer; and even after so expressing himself, and permitting the organizer to commence operations in his school, it is to be distinctly understood that he is not bound to carry out the plan or to effect the alterations suggested by the organizer.

32. The inspectors should therefore select those schools only for organization the managers of which are likely to exhibit a kind and co-operative spirit to the organizers.

33. Before a school can be organized, the manager

must provide a sufficient stock for the use of the children attending it. As already announced to the Inspectors, the Commissioners, on the recommendation of the Head or District Inspector or the organizer, will make a small grant of charts, black-boards, easels, pointers, &c., proportioned according to the wants and attendance of the school, not exceeding, however, except in special cases, the value of £5.

34. When an organizer enters a school he is carefully to observe the methods of teaching pursued by teachers and monitors, the order, discipline, arrangements, and general organization of the school; and he is afterwards to report, on a form prepared for the purpose, the exact state in which he finds the school in all these respects. This report is called the *Preliminary Report*, somewhat altered from the preliminary report accompanying this.

35. When an organizer has completed the organization of a school, he is to make a report of the order, discipline, system, &c., established by him; to detail the exact state in which he leaves the school, and to record the general results of the organization. This report is called the *Final Report*, somewhat altered from the final report accompanying this.

36. The organizer is then to forward the two reports just referred to to the Inspector of the district in which the school is situated.

37. After a period of not less than three weeks, and not more than six weeks, from the completion of the organization of the school, the Inspector of the district is to inspect the school, with a special view of ascertaining the effectiveness of the organization, and of examining and checking in detail all the points and statements contained in the organizer's final report.

38. The District Inspector is then to forward this report, along with the organizer's preliminary and final reports, to the Head Inspector of the district, who will afterwards transmit them to this office.

39. During the time that a school is under organization the Inspector is not to make a formal inspection of it, nor sooner after the organization is completed than the time mentioned in paragraph 37; and it is the express wish of the Commissioners that the employment of an organizer in a district may interfere as little as possible with the usual and regular business of inspection.

40. It is, however, exceedingly desirable that the Inspector should make as many *incidental visits* as possible to a school under organization, to see that the work is proceeding with regularity and vigour, to confer with the managers, and stimulate them to a hearty co-operation with the organizer, to assist in removing local difficulties or impediments, and to extend, as much as lies in his power, the advantages accruing to the National system from the operations of the organizers.

41. No organizer should for the present be sent to any place where there are not, at least, four National schools within a circuit of three miles from it, the managers of which are desirous that their schools may receive the advantages of organization.

42. No less than four, or more than eight, schools are for the present to be organized by the same organizer in any particular locality.

43. As a general rule, the time spent in the organization of a school is not to exceed a fortnight; but the organizer is to return for a day or two, if necessary, before he leaves the locality in which the school is situated, to observe the results of the organization, and give such further instruction to teachers and monitors as the state of the school may at the time suggest as necessary and important.

44. The two weeks which may be spent by an organizer in a school are not to be consecutive, a week, in all cases, is to elapse between the first and second parts of the organization. For instance, where four schools, A, B, C, D, are to be organized, the following may be the order of organization—

First week,	A	Next week,	C
Next week,	B	Next week,	D
Next week,	A	Next week,	C
Next week,	B	Next week,	D

45. The second great object which the Commissioners of National Education have had in view in establishing the staff of organizers, as already stated in paragraph 1 B, is "to diffuse a knowledge of school-mastership in all its practical bearings, and also of the leading principles of the science of education amongst 'the teachers of the country.'"

46. To carry out this great object each organizer will deliver a course of lectures to the teachers who live in the neighbourhood of the school in which he is engaged, upon method, order, discipline, school accounts, employment of monitors, construction of timetables, arrangement of school furniture, use of charts, tables, and apparatus, industrial education, and upon organization generally.

47. These lectures will take place on Saturdays, at whatever hour may be most convenient to the organizers and the teachers.

48. The District Inspector is to invite all teachers living within a reasonable walking distance—four or five miles—to these lectures, and whilst attendance is, under no circumstances, to be considered as compulsory, it is to be understood that the Commissioners will regard with satisfaction the conduct of those teachers who attend the instructions.

49. None but schoolmasters and monitors in their fourth year, *and* to attend the lectures of male organizers, and none are to attend the instructions of the female organizers but schoolmistresses and monitoresses in their fourth year.

50. Teachers, whether trained or not, are eligible for admission into the organizer's classes; for it is hoped that both the trained and the untrained will derive such advantage from the instructions as to qualify them the better for a skilful and efficient discharge of their duties.

51. The organizers will keep a roll of the attendance of the teachers, and submit it at the end of the course of instruction to the District Inspector.

52. The organizers will require the teachers who may attend to take such notes during each lecture as will enable them to write out an abstract of it before the day for the following lecture; these abstracts and whatever other written notices the organizers may require the teachers to prepare for them are to be examined and noted by the organizer, and submitted from time to time to the District or Head Inspector, to be afterwards, however, in the corrected state, returned to the teacher.

53. A statement will be made at the end of each course of lectures by the organizers, for the information of the Inspectors and Commissioners, of the attention paid by each of the teachers to their instructions, and of the proficiency which each of them shall have made.

54. As the duties of an organizer, when organizing a school, will be such as to prevent him from doing much more in reference to methods of teaching, than exemplifying and carrying into practical effect the instructions contained in his lectures, no school can be organized, the teacher of which does not attend, or shall not have attended, a course of lectures either from him or some other organizer.

55. The Commissioners desire that the Inspectors should devote as much attention as possible to the management and superintendence of these weekly meetings, and they also desire that the Inspectors should sustain and encourage the organizers on these occasions, uphold their authority, give weight to their position, and contribute by every means in their power to their success.

56. Before an organizer commences operations in a

locality, the Inspector should have all necessary arrangements with managers and teachers completed, as to the schools to be organized and the teachers who are to form the Saturday class for practical instruction.

57. Whenever a District Inspector feels that the services of an organizer are required for any particular group of his schools, all the conditions already announced being either fully complied with, or in a fair way of being so, he is to communicate with this office, giving information on the following points:—

(a) As to the centre which he proposes for the residence of the organizer, selecting, of course, a place in which a suitable lodging cannot be procured for him and his family.

(b) As to the schools which he recommends for organization and the distance of each from the proposed residence of the organizer.

(c) As to the number of teachers who would likely attend the lectures of the organizer upon Saturdays.

58. Each District Inspector is requested to inform this office, within a week after the receipt of this circular letter, upon the points commented in the previous paragraph.

59. The office, on receipt of these communications, will advise them to the Head Inspector, whose duty it will be to select the schools proposed to be organized, to instruct the organizers as to the schools assigned them, and the time of the commencement of the organization, and immediately to advise the office as to the steps then taken.

60. In order to place the object and details of the system of organization, and the machinery by which it is worked, as fully and clearly as possible before the Inspectors, the Commissioners append printed copies of the reports referred to in paragraphs 34 and 35. These reports, printed verbatim from the copies furnished by the organizer, are selected principally because the school to which they refer, from being one of the worst town schools in connexion with the Board, has become, since its organization, distinguished for the business and completeness of its arrangements, and the general excellence of the order, discipline, and methods of teaching pursued in it. The Inspectors should peruse these reports carefully, inasmuch as they exhibit, with considerable precision, the chief points and details in the organization of a school.

61. The District Inspectors are requested to circulate, as extensively as possible, amongst managers, teachers, and the public generally, information as to the object, scope, and leading features of organization, so let managers understand that the presence of an organizer in their schools neither affects their privileges, nor interferes with their functions, to induce teachers that organization is intended to diminish in no way their authority in their schools, or to disengage them in the execution of their pupils or the parents, to acquiesce in all claims interested in the education of the people, that an organizer has nothing whatever to say or do in relation to the arrangements for religious instruction; that, on the contrary, it is the aim of the Commissioners, in the measures now taken by them for the improvement of their schools, to uphold the rights of managers, to strengthen the power of the teachers, by rendering them more skilful servants of the public, and to realize what the Board have long desired to attain, a scheme of organization which, by combining all that educational science appears in the matter of instruction and concerned in school keeping, will give a distinctive stamp and uniform character to the schools conducted on the National system.

## APPENDIX TO MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

1992

## APPENDIX No. VII

REVENUE showing the AMOUNT of GRATUITIES awarded for TRAINING MONITORS beyond their usual period of service, for the years 1861 to year 1866, inclusive.  
[See Question 1896, page 87.—Mr. Keenan's Evidence.]

APPENDIX,  
No. 2.

[illegible]

## APPENDIX No. VIII

ESTIMATE and EXPENDITURE, Year ended the 31st March, 1867.

[See Question 3009, page 144—Mr. Kelly's Evidence.]

APPENDIX,  
No. 2.[illegible]

Note 1.—At Coft, Balfast, Zemerick, and Killybegs Model Schools the literacy and agricultural departments are carried on in the same establishment so that many times of expenditure should be properly divided, and these are charged to the agricultural branch, which, some thought for a certain of these.

NOTE II.—That two copies of Her Majesty's Stationery Office documents, numbered, C2,742 and 226, 18-6

## EXTRACTS FROM REPORTS OF INSPECTORS, for year 1866, on the state of the NATIONAL SCHOOL-ROOMS, in their respective Districts.

(See Question 10361, p. 432—Mr. Kavanagh's Evidence.)

Mr. Cresswell, Letterkenny District, states that—  
"During the winter months, nearly all the schools in the district are over-crowded."

Mr. Brown, Ballymena District, states that—"In about one-fourth of the schools the accommodation is indifferent and inadequate."

Mr. Wood, says that—"Of 70 non-vested schools in the Donegal District, 32 are very bad."

Mr. Adams, Sligo District, states that—"Of 360 schools in his charge, 90 are bad, as regards space and other essential particulars."

Mr. Mealy, writing of the Keshidale District, says—

"Viewed as a whole, the school-rooms in the district afford rather indifferent accommodation, at least 50 per cent. of them are so miserable, that if a reasonable prospect existed that better could be provided, they should not be allowed to enjoy Board's grants. Unfortunately, the landed proprietors, as a body, are opposed to our schools, hence, in many cases, poor cottages are the only resource, unless the people are left without the means of education."

Mr. Bowdler, Monaghan District, states—"In a few instances the school-rooms are more cubical, badly lighted and ventilated, not originally intended for school purposes, and available in every respect."

Mr. O'Brien, Ballina District, states—"In more than one-half of all the schools, the accommodation is still of an inferior description."

Mr. J. W. Rodgers, Boyle District, states—"Many of the school-rooms are defective as to draft—space, light, and ventilation."

Mr. H. W. Rodgers, Carrig District, states—"That in a few of the schools the accommodation is decidedly satisfactory."

Mr. MacDonnell states of the schools in the Drogheda District, that "four of the rooms are very ill suited for school purposes, and four others stand greatly in need of alteration."

Mr. Spawer, Westport District, in which 42 per cent. of its 84 schools are vested in the Commissioners, says "that 15 of the 68 are either indifferent or wholly bad, some of them are commonly taken from their unsuitable circumstances, and the remainder are partially inadequate, owing to the suspension of the grants, to which they are frequently liable."

Mr. McSherry, Roscommon District, states, the accommodation afforded by 43 of his 112 school apartments "is inadequate at all seasons of the year. There are a great many schools in which the furniture is poor and old, and few ready to replace, except the teachers, whose rooms are heavily taxed by their own personal wants."

Mr. Brindley, Longford District, states—"Many of the school-rooms are thatched with clay floors, and windows not sufficiently high for proper ventilation or light; the rooms too small for the attendance several months in the year, the furniture not of a proper description, and the desks such as to delay the children's progress in learning to write."

Mr. Corrie, Ballinacorney District, states—"The chief defects in the school buildings throughout this district appear to me to be exactly those that characterize the dwellings of the poorer classes generally, seeing they are defective in breathing space, and in the arrangements for the proper ventilation, lighting, and heating of the apartment."

Mr. Gaudin, Thos. District, states—"The accommodation in many of the non-vested schools, both in town and in the rural portions, is very fine. The houses, many of them, have been altered from dwelling-houses, and are very comfortable, well lighted, and well ventilated school-rooms ought to be. In winter, when the attendance, especially at the rural schools, is at a maximum, many of the schools are so much overcrowded, that it would seem to be almost impossible for much efficient work to be done in them. Most of the non-vested schools are quite too small and ill adapted to school purposes, both from deficient light

in winter, and the want of suitable accommodation either in space or in desks."

Mr. O'Neil, Ballinacorney District, states—"In eight or ten cases the door space is insufficient for the average attendance. In three or four cases the houses are not suitable, being thatched with the ordinary type, and originally built without any special adaptation to the purposes which they now serve."

Mr. O'Connell, South Dublin District, states—"In many cases the accommodation is very bad, viz., the former-tenement male school and infant schools are held in the rooms of an old private house, totally unsuitable to school purposes, very deficient in ventilation and in fitting up, and altogether too small for the attendance. The joint-tenement male and infant schools are not selected to accommodate one-half of the children who assemble there. The side walls are only about five feet high—about 100 in a room not fit for 50s. Dalrymple's house school is held in a house also most calamitous and unsuitable, all full of draughts. The two former tenements, young women, &c., as I am informed, while in charge of it, and I fear the unsuitable house contributed to their untimely death. Rathfriland National School is a ruin. The St. Michael and John's female schools are held in an old ruinous store, over a hord and bacon factory, beside unsuitable yards, and the majority of the National schools of the city have no playgrounds."

Mr. Cope, Carlow District, states—"The playgrounds, where there are any at all, are generally unsatisfactory, and in many cases there are none, the one being beside a yardline."

Mr. MacSherry, Bray District, states—"In the mountainous parts of the district, and in some localities of country Westward that are not continuous, very indifferent school-houses are to be met with as before, and the want of residences for the teachers is still too general."

Mr. Connelley, of the Gort District, that "in some few of the non-vested schools, the accommodation is inadequate."

Mr. Lander says—"That at some periods of the year, in the Thurin District, a few of the school-rooms are too small for the attendance."

Mr. W. R. Myles, of the Athy District, states "defective of the non-vested schools are defective, as regards the nature and amount of accommodation."

Mr. Barrett, describing the school-houses in the Rosin District, says—"The majority of them are thatched and of an inferior description; and in such the greater number of the school-houses the accommodation is badly insufficient for the number of pupils who attend."

Mr. Brown says that in the Tipperary District—"In a few cases, the houses are neither adequate to the attendance, nor otherwise suitable, five of these are miserable cabins, deficient in desk and class space, as well as in the means of light and ventilation."

Mr. Dwyer says that, in the Keshidale District, "a large number of the schools have neither playgrounds nor garden attached. I consider this latter a great want indeed, and whereas it exists that it should render the school profitable for and from the Board."

Mr. Phelan, writing of the Lisnackill District, states that—"In too frequent instances, houses of an inferior character, and very indifferently, not to say badly, furnished, are to be met with."

Mr. Blake, of the Newmarket, West, District, reports that—"There are sixteen schools in the district in which the accommodation is of an inferior description or altogether insufficient for the usual attendance."

Mr. MacDonnell complains of many of the vested schools in the Keshidale District, and of the teachers of the Board of Works in replying that—

Mr. Kealy says that "in seven non-vested schools in the Bally District the accommodation is bad, and in seven more it is very bad."

Mr. O'Connell states "that in eleven schools in the Dunsany District the accommodation is insufficient."

## APPENDIX No. X.

REPORT ON OLDCASTLE ENDOWED SCHOOLS, by JAMES W. KAVANAUGH, Esq. (formerly) Head Inspector of Irish National Schools, December 13th, 1853.

[See Question 16941, p. 444.—Mr. Kavanagh's evidence.]

Education Office, December 13th, 1853.

GENTLEMEN,—Application having been made by one of your members (on behalf of the trustees) to the Commissioners of National Education that one of their inspectors should examine the Oldcastle Endowed Schools, I was instructed to undertake this duty; and I have now the honour to submit my report of an examination of the boys' and girls' schools, held by me and by my assistant, Mr. O'Sullivan (Sub-Inspector), on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, the 20th, 21st, and 22nd October.

It afforded me great pleasure to have had the advantage of the presence of Mr. Naper and the Rev. Mr. Dwyer, on two, and of the Rev. Mr. Leonard on one of the days of examination; and at the request of some of the trustees I beg to include in my report on the present state of the schools some few suggestions towards their improvement, with a view to render this excellent charity more efficient in promoting the education of the youth of the town and vicinity.

## I. STATISTICS AND ACCOUNT BOOKS.

The accounts of the numbers in attendance, and of the individual history and proficiency of the boys, although latterly attended to lately, are in a most unsatisfactory state. The school-rolls are ill kept, and are not preserved; the register has scarcely any reference to a school, and referring only to questions pertaining to the distribution of clothes, &c., would equally apply to any institution where such are given; and the report book of the numbers in daily attendance bears no date for years, and entries in it were rarely made.

Year	Number present marked for 25 days only.
1840,	45
1841,	16
1842,	16
1843,	15
1844,	15
1845,	15
1846,	15
1847,	15
1848,	15
1849,	15
1850,	15
1851,	15

Total for 10 years' attendance marked on 241 days.

It appears, therefore, that on an average of ten years the number of boys in attendance was recorded only 34 days in each year, or rather less than three times in each month. Improvement has taken place lately in this respect, the entries for 1852 including 174 days, and in the first nine months of 1853 124 days' attendance. The entries in the girls' school are fuller, and the accounts kept with much more care and attention; they show 226 school-days for 1852, including 42 Saturdays, whilst for the same period the entries book shows 174 school-days, including 16 Saturdays.

The average daily attendance during the year 1852 was (excluding that on Saturdays):

Boys,	133
Girls,	145
Total,	278

Now, supposing that the number of pupils who are on the roll, and who occasionally attend, to be double the number in average daily attendance, about 550 children receive instruction in the school, each year. Looking to the census of 1851, we find the population of

Oldcastle Parish,	3,008
Loughcrew,	908
Maynooth,	2,762
Total,	6,678

and within these, there are only two small National schools, Loughcrew and Ballinacorney, and in addition to this population the children from several townlands in Outkington, should attend Oldcastle school. Taking

all local circumstances into account, at least 1,000 children should attend these schools during the year.

II. EXAMINATION OF PUPILS.  
BOYS' SCHOOL.

On the 20th October, there were present 131 boys, chosen, three, by the teachers:

Boys in 1st Book,	60 boys.
" 2nd "	29 "
" 3rd "	7 "
" 4th "	12 "
" 5th "	30 "
" 6th "	15 "

Of these 131 boys, there were—

3 able to read 4th Book, fairly,	
8 " 3rd " tolerably,	
5 " 2nd " poorly,	
3 " 1st " poorly well,	
GRAMMAR—Elementary,	20
" Parsing,	12

Of these 42 boys, 5 wrote with tolerable accuracy, and 14 knew the parts of speech pretty well.

DICTIONARY, 13

Of these 13 boys, 3 wrote in any sentence with tolerable accuracy, and 8 with ease and correctness.

GEOMETRY, 71

In geometry the answering of the senior class was tolerable, except in mathematical geography.

DICTIONARY, 13	Answering very poor.
ARITHMETIC—Simple Rules,	36
" Compound,	24
" Properties, &c.,	12

Answering of the 6th class, very bad—

Of 15, only 3 right in Notation,	
" 8 " 1 " Subtraction,	
" 12 " 6 " Compound Multiplication,	
" 8 " 4 " Properties,	
" 2 " 1 " Practice,	

MENTAL ARITHMETIC, 8 boys.—In this no proficiency made.

Writing—on dates, { A few of the senior boys write a good hand, and on the whole, the style of penmanship is good.

Grammar, 5.—No proficiency made in this branch.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY. No proficiency made—none known.

SCRIPTURE EXTRACTS. General answering very good.

The summary of the examination is this: the style of reading is bad, and the fraction of children able to read a simple narrative intelligently, is, altogether, below what we find in the average of all the National schools in Ireland; the knowledge of the subject-matter of the earlier lesson-books is tolerable, only 1 in 26 of the boys can parse an easy sentence with fair accuracy, but 1 in 9 (in addition to these) can distinguish the parts of speech; the answering in writing from dictation, revealed great deficiency in correct spelling, and the oral examination in the several classes, showed a similar result; a very fair knowledge of local geography was shown from the senior class, but mathematical geography has yet to receive more attention, and the junior classes are altogether ignorant of any knowledge of the rude outline of geography. In the important branch of arithmetic, the answering was extremely bad.

Of 37 boys, only 4 entered correctly " 5/100/100" from dictation	
" " 17 worked a sum, correctly, in notation	
" " 31 " in Multiplication of Money	
" 22 " 4 " Simple Properties	
" 6 " 1 " Practice	
" 5 " 5 " Simple Interest	

In mental calculations no proficiency has been made; the 9 boys who have commenced geometry, have, as yet, made no progress; the Scripture Extracts (some numbers), and the outlines of Scripture History, are tolerably well known, but their chronology requires further attention. Professor Johnston's catechism of agricultural chemistry, is committed to memory, by the senior class, but, on examination, I could not elicit any real knowledge of its subject.

Appendix,  
No. 13.

The pupils are altogether over-crowded, or placed beyond their attainments, and on their return after long absence from school, they do not appear to be examined or classed *de novo*; the proportion of pupils in the lower classes is too large, nearly half of them being in words of one syllable, and 160 of the 136, failed to read correctly an advanced lesson in the Second Book; the school exhibits few traces of skillful organization; the order and discipline are very inferior, insufficient attention is bestowed on securing personal cleanliness in the children, several of the monitors are wholly unfit for their duty, and they receive quite insufficient special instruction to qualify them for the business they are to discharge; the teaching staff is large, but inefficient and unqualified, and the amount of effective school-time, is extremely limited.

Under the present management, the year appears to be thus divided:—

	Days.
Sundays, .....	52
Roman Catholic Holydays 16, but 5 fall in Vacation, ..	7
Holidays, as follows:—	23
Saturdays, half days, .....	36
Vacation, Christmas, 5 weeks of 12 days, ..	24
Easter, 14 weeks of six days, ..	
Harvest, 4 weeks of 15 days, ..	124
Full school days, .....	
Total, .....	265 days

Now this would give nearly  $3\frac{1}{2}$  school-days in each week, this, however, is an over estimate, as during 1852, there were in the

Boys' school, 128 days, and 16 Saturdays, as halves, 140 days.	
Girls' " 126 " 42 " 167 "	

or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days per week in the boys', and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days in the girls' school. The effective value of this very small school-time is reduced to one-half by the fact, that the pupils attend not fully half their time, and it lies to enforce a still further reduction, from the laxity of discipline in the school, which permits the pupils to come in at any hour, up to, and as I was witness, beyond 11 o'clock in the morning. This is an evil of the most serious character, and to remedy which, calls for immediate and stringent measures.

#### GIRLS' SCHOOL.

There were 147 girls present at the examination, and these were classed as follows:—

Between 1st Book, .....	49 girls
" 2nd " .....	24 "
" 3rd " .....	20 "
" 4th " .....	17 "
" 5th " .....	8 "

Of these 147 girls, 8 read 4th Book very well,  
17 " 3rd " satisfactorily,  
10 " " pretty fairly,  
18 " 2nd " with care and intelligence.

GRAMMAR, 95, of whom 22 gave well, and 12 knew parts of speech.

ENGLISH, 25, of whom 12 wrote with fluency, and 7 with tolerable accuracy.

Geography, 88: Senior classes answered remarkably well on maps of Europe and Ireland, and on mathematical geography.

DEATH, 100: Some progress in position, affluence, and costs.

ARITHMETIC: Simple rules answered extremely well.

Composition, 4: Written not properly taught.

Population, and 4: Written not properly taught.

Mental, 25: Proficiency yet very limited.

Simple addition, ..... 4 of 7 right. |

Compound Multiplication, ..... 3 of 7 right. |

Proportion, ..... 5 of 7 right. |

Fractions, ..... 3 of 5 right. |

Written on paper, 37, copies extremely good, subject well taught.

On the whole, the style of reading is altogether higher in the girls' than in the boys' school, greater ease; greater fluency; a pronunciation freer from provincialisms, and a command of imagination, which, when combined with apprehension of the subject-matter, is the essential feature of reading with expression. Connected with the statement of superior reading, and by far superior numbers in the girls', as compared with the boys' school, it is but justice to the latter to mention, 1st, that *ceteris paribus*, girls have a greater taste for, and more readily attain excellence in reading than boys; 2ndly, the average age of the

girls of senior classes, considerably exceeds that of the boys; and 3rdly, from the large staff of young women, who act as monitors, the teaching power, in the girls' school, is far more effective than that in the boys'. In English grammar, the girls answered far better than the boys, in parsing the same forms, at the rate of three lines to each pupil.

Of 12 boys in 5th class, 10 missed 52 words, or over 5 each, whilst 2 boys were so deficient that they could not distinguish the parts of speech.

Of 8 girls in 5th class, 6 missed only 3 words, or an error between each 3, and 2 other girls missed 13 between them.

The results of the answering in grammar are, as the whole, twice more favorable to the girls' school.

The proficiency of the girls in geography was tolerably good, except in mathematical geography, the use of the imaginary lines, &c.; as in the boys' school, the junior classes are not furnished at a sufficiently early stage, with the leading features, relative positions, &c., of the great divisions of the earth, as the map of the World. In arithmetic, the answering of the girls was extremely bad, and quite out of character with the otherwise general merit of the school. The penmanship is nearly all that need be desired in point of neatness and finish, and has the rare merit of possessing the symmetry and legibility of round, combined with the elegance and grace of angular hand.

I regret to be obliged to notice a defect that constantly forced itself on my attention while in the school,—a marked absence of that delicacy and modesty, which, from their age, should be expected as an instinct, in some of the more grown girls in the school. This refers rather to carriage, tone, and bearing, than to any supposed deficiency in moral goodness; in fact, I felt disappointed that such intellectual activity, and the advantage of daily intercourse, as Miss Murphy, had not had more influence in giving the manners of a few of the grown girls, a more feminine character.

I understand the needle and other work done by the girls is of a very superior order, on this occasion I saw but little of it, other matters having engrossed all my attention.

#### RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

The religious instruction of the children being amply provided for by the services of Rev. Mr. Dandies and Rev. Mr. Leonard, as chaplains to those of their respective communities, I have only to add, from the report of both gentlemen, that this important portion of the education of the pupils receives due attention. I beg leave, however, to suggest, that instead of the whole of Monday being devoted to this purpose, that two hours, or two hours and a half, either in the forenoon, or the afternoon of that day, be devoted to religious instruction, and the remainder of the day to secular instruction. Children of tender years, or even adults, could not well continue for five hours together at religious instruction without listlessness and inattention, and in the Dublin Model and other such schools, a couple of hours is the amount of time desired by the clergymen for this object.

#### INDUSTRIAL TRAINING.

Since the Oldcastle schools came into operation, the most important social changes have taken place in Ireland, and several of these bear directly on the principle of this charity bequeathed for the education of the poor (as I understand) of Oldcastle; the really poor or destitute, have since been removed, and their education undertaken by the State, in the Union workhouse, so that for the last 13 years, the very class for whose elevation the testator meant his bequest, has been excluded from it, under Act of Parliament. A school such as this, which secured freedom of conscience and non-compulsion in matters of religion, was a wonderful boon, when the Chancellor made his order for its establishment in 1828, but three years after, saw the rise of a school-system

Printed image digitised by the University of Southampton Library Digitisation Unit



with this principle recognised as its basis, and which has since so commended the assent of the nation that it has grown into one of the matured institutions of the island, with nearly 600,000 children within its over 8,000 schools. The passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Act did not take effect for several years after the death of the testator, and this great measure by drawing open to the mass of the nation offices from which had been for centuries debarr'd, stimulated the lower classes to educate their children; and in their anxiety to pay for it popular education lost much of that paternalist and eleemosynary character which before had been its inseparable feature. Whilst these great changes—Catholic Emancipation, the National System, and the Irish Poor Law—have deeply affected the principle of the charity which you administer, you appear to adhere to the same fixed regulations as the mode in which you carry it out.

From January, 1853, to September 19th, 1853, there were admitted to the girls' school:

151 Children of Labourers,	
33	" Farmers,
61	" Tradesmen,
55	" Clerical,
15	" Servants,
14	" Shopkeepers,
5	" Persons with no recorded occupation,
18	" Of whom no note on this head was taken.

Total, 352

There is nothing in the nature of the case to lead us to suspect that the proportions in this return do not equally apply to the boys' school, and I shall therefore adopt it for both. All these children get free tuition, free books and requisites, are eligible for premiums, sabbath coat clothes, and some get apprenticeship fees. I estimated clothes to the amount of from £170 to £250 per annum are distributed to the children. Now, I have no doubt, that at least one half the pupils, looking to the social grades occupied by their parents, should pay reasonable rates for their tuition, and purchase their school requisites at moderate prices, and not to appropriate the funds of the charity, or of the teachers, but for their parents' sake and for their own. Personal responsibility is weakened, self-reliance is impaired; respect for the school, for the teachers, and for education, in itself, is lessened, and regularity and punctuality of attendance are unattainable. The receipts from school-fees might be usefully applied as premiums of books, maps, &c., in supplying scientific apparatus, diagrams, models, and objects for the schools, in adding the salary of a drawing master and of a singing master; or half the amount of the fees given to the teachers of the schools would form a good connecting link between the children and them. In the central model schools, in the ten district model schools, in all the schools under the direct management of the National Board, school-fees, prepaid, are exacted of every child in attendance, and even in required should the child be absent, but desire to have its name retained on the school-roll. For your information I beg leave to refer to a few of these district model schools situated in small towns like your own.

Pup. Intr. Sch.		1853			
		Average Daily At- tendance	School Fees	Amount of Books bought	
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
1,700	Northbrook's District Model Schools,	112	28 4 4	11 3 4	
1,500	Trillick	75	40 1 4	Not recorded	
1,512	Thornhill's, county Cork,	227	75 15 0	10 5 3	
1,071	Glenties,	225	10	None	

The Commissioners, who framed these regulations, administer an annual fund of £180,000, and twenty-two years' experience determines them in making the schools, or, *as far as possible*, self-supporting.

In the case of the children of labourers, servants, &c., they, and indeed all the children, should get some industrial training. There is no boy who has to earn his bread by his hands but should have these hands in

daily training, for at least an hour or two, from nine to twelve years of age, and two to four hours from twelve to fifteen years. He would thus on entering "the battle of life" be familiar with the use of the weapons with which alone, industrially speaking, it can be won; a body of trained and skilled labourers would be raised, whose daily choicest would be:

"No parish-money or loaf,  
No pauper-bounty for any;  
A sin of the soul, by right of self,  
Enlighten to my foe."

and as five-sixths of the pupils are either directly or indirectly connected with land, the cultivation of a school farm of ten to fifteen acres by spade husbandry, and a portion of it divided into small allotments, rented and tilled by the senior boys, would develop the muscular vigour of the pupils, improve their health; train them to the dignity of manual labour; sharpen their mental faculties, and furnished with a rotation of crops, the house-doing of cattle, the economy of manures, and the principles and practice of scientific agriculture, there would be scattered, broadcast, through the vicinity with an amount of superior agricultural skill, both as to the use of improved implements and the application of scientific principles, as much in a short time elevate the character of the locality, as to skilled husbandry.

When the founder of this benevolent charity made his bequest, industrial education was totally unknown in the British Isles, and were he now here to witness the changes which over thirty years have produced, he would see that while clothing the naked is yet, and will ever be, held as a work of mercy, a still greater work is teaching the naked to clothe themselves, and the hungry to feed themselves, and, with this idea, I would most respectfully urge on the trustees to restrict their charity to clothes, &c., and apply it to the widow, the orphan, and most permanent charity of *industry* of training, which together with the moral, religious, and intellectual training to which the children are subjected, would give integrity to the whole scheme, and render the institution one of the noblest in the empire.

#### TEACHERS

Your master, Mr. Pellatt, is, as I am sure you all feel, a highly respectable man, well-informed, of respectable address and means; and since he entered your service, he has become a graduate of the Dublin University. He appears more anxious as to the success of his school and pupils, and I have no doubt, brings sincere conscientiousness to bear on the discharge of his duties. It is to be regretted that in the earlier part of his career, he had not the benefit of a regular course of training in a good normal school; and the more so, seeing that the school is altogether isolated, and shut out from those advantages which arise from intercourse with inspectors and educationists, whose entire study it is to watch the daily improving systems of school-organization and methods of teaching, not only in Ireland and the British Empire, but over the civilized world. This I conceive to be a vital defect in the position of your school, and one which mainly has produced the cramped, narrow, and mechanical routine, which it presents to the observation of an educationist. To an average National school it is thus necessarily isolated as a pond is to a spring, the one self-contained and conservative, the other, an ever-flowing supply.

The mistress, Miss Murphy, was trained under the National Board, and conducted with great credit, as you are aware, a National school in Moyrath for several years. She exhibits considerable skill, indefatigable zeal, and generally speaking, great success, in the management of the school. Its order and discipline are yet open, however, to some improvement.

I have now beg leave to submit for the consideration of the trustees, the following suggestions, and upon which I have bestowed all the attention in my power, with a view to the improvement of the Oldcastle schools:—

1. That an infants' school be at once established

for all children under 8 years of age. Numbers of children in the town of 3 to 5 or 6 years, who do not now attend school, would attend the infants' school. By a partition, a room 29 feet long, cut off from the western end of the girls' school, would leave the latter a yet noble room, 50 feet in length, and a suitable infants' school-room would be provided. This to be fitted and furnished for the purpose—gallery, prints, cases of objects, &c., to be supplied. The prize classes in both schools are quite neglected, and the teachers have neither taste nor qualifications to train children of their age, and, moreover, their presence in the schools retards the progress of the senior classes. A first-rate infants' teacher could be procured from the National Board, at a salary of £255 a year, with the furnished apartments lately occupied by your workmen.

There would still be a classroom wanted for the girls' school, and which perhaps might best be obtained by a plan such as that here roughly sketched, which would give a class room 39 by 16 feet, with a gallery of 8 steps, and an infants' school to accommodate 100 children, of same dimensions.



The boys' school to have one class-room with gallery and the other corresponding room to serve as a board-room for the meeting of the trustees, and fitted up with presses, &c., for stock of books, stationery, &c.

A play ground with covered shed at the sheltered side, to be fitted up for the infants, and a small yard, with suitable privies, to be set apart for their use.

The schools are inefficiently warmed, and the stone floors might be removed, and boards substituted. The flags are both damp and cold in winter. The desks in both schools are too long and too numerous, and a supply of forms of graduated heights, and not fixed to the floor, should be provided. A dozen black-boards, 3 by 2 feet are required for each school, and also a ball-frame or head-table for each. A glass-case to contain a collection of metallic ores, rocks, raw materials, their several manufactured products, &c., should be supplied to each school, and object-cases given thirteen cheap models, illustrative of the mechanical powers, the steam engine, &c., Professor Johnson's large sheets of illustrations of the Principles of Natural Philosophy, a cheap set of chemical apparatus, sufficient to illustrate by experiment, Hodge's Agricultural Chemistry, diagrams of the outlines of Zoology and of Botany, and a pair of globes, would be required in the boys' school. There might also be added a few cases of drawing instruments, scales, &c., 2 Gunter's chain, a cheap theodolite, a marine's compass (price about 10s.), a barometer and thermometer. For the girls' school, a terrestrial globe, and the diagrams in Natural History might be supplied. A circulating school-library is also much required; that for boys' school might contain, besides works on history, travel, biography, natural history, poetry, English literature, fiction, &c., useful works on agriculture, the arts and manufactures, and

various special branches of industry. The girls' portion to embrace works on cooking, domestic thrift, &c.

I beg leave to further recommend, that as soon as possible, the trustees introduce singing as a daily portion of the school instruction, and also elementary drawing. This could best be done by engaging the services of a person competent to instruct in both, and who would likely accept a salary of £100 for one year, at the end of which period your teachers should be competent to continue the instruction in both branches in their schools. It is quite unnecessary to discuss here, the importance of these as a portion of popular education.

I recommend that 10 to 15 acres of land, convenient to the schools, be taken, that the services of a first-rate agricultural teacher be secured, and who shall also act as second master in the literary department, in the schools, and that to him be committed the industrial instruction and training of the boys. He should be thoroughly conversant with the principles of scientific husbandry, and show skill and aptitude in communicating this knowledge to the industrial class, he should be eminently practical in the management of a farm, and should in addition be a trained and respectfully educated literary teacher. Such a teacher would expect a salary of not less than £70 with apartments, or rent in lieu thereof. It would be out of place here to give detailed suggestions as to the organization of the industrial training, but if the farm be taken, and a competent teacher appointed, I shall most willingly give suggestions to aid this most important object.

#### MONITRESS.

With a second master, six monitress would quite suffice as a teaching staff in the 'boys' school. These should not be less than 13, nor over 10 years when appointed, and should hold office for 4 years.

Their salary should be:

1st Year, . . . . .	26	
2nd " . . . . .	5	
3rd " . . . . .	7	
4th " . . . . .	9	To be paid quarterly.

As there are so many grown girls, I am of opinion it would be better to increase the staff of really efficient monitresses, than appoint an assistant teacher. I therefore recommend that 8 qualified monitresses be selected at the above rates of salary.

#### INSPECTION.

I have no hope even of the ample suggestions already given, were carried out in all their integrity, that this, or any similar institution, can keep its place amongst the active educational establishments of the country, without regular and authorized inspection and examination. Your public exhibitions, are so examination, and teachers, pupils, and examiners all feel that they are not. Careful detailed and professional supervision is absolutely necessary, or your schools must inevitably sink into the condition of some of the old charity schools in England. This can be obtained in two ways; either by connecting your schools with one of the two Irish systems which employ Inspectors, or by engaging the services of an Inspector, at a salary proportioned to the extent of attention which you may require. If you join the National system, you would likely be entitled to the following aid, roughly estimated:

Salaries to 4 or 5 Teachers, including Grant to Industrial Department, . . . . .	£120
Paid Monitors, . . . . .	20
Saving by Books, Registers, &c., . . . . .	30
	£170

In addition, you would be secured a full examination of your schools three times a year, the advice of the Agricultural Inspector, in the management of your farm, and from our visits to the schools, we would be able to recommend the most deserving of your pupils for situations under the National system. Likely the Commissioners might deem fit to aid you with impec-

tion only, but in either case your control over your teachers and your charity would be numbered by the commission, conformity to their rules, being the only condition to entitle you to aid. It is also open to you to engage the services of an Inspector, to make two half-yearly examinations of your schools, each to occupy a week, and if you desire to hold a public examination, it would occupy the chief part of a week; and for this duty, with a half-yearly report on the state of the schools, £30 per annum, together with hotel and travelling allowances, would be a moderate stipend or fee.

I strongly recommend you to adopt the rolls, report-book, register, &c., of the National Board, and from January, 1864, that no other be used in your schools; also that in revising the whole question of programme, clothes, &c., regularly of attendance for the entire of previous year, and good conduct, &c., be taken into account, in making the awards.

Pursued of heavy public duty, and recent delicacy of health, are my apology for the delay in preparing this report, which I have now the honour to submit to

the trustees of the Oldcastle Endowed School, with the deepest conviction, that, one and all, they labour to carry out the benevolent intentions of the testator, and for which I, in common with all friends to popular enlightenment, beg most anxiously to tender you my admiration, and remain,

Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH,

Head Inspector of National Schools.

To The Right Hon. Sir John Young, Bart., Chief Secretary for Ireland, James J. Napier, Esq., D.L., Loughnew, Gerald Dwyer, Esq., D.L., Turbotstown, Rev. Mr. Darden, Rector of Oldcastle, and Rev. Geo. Leonard, F.R., Oldcastle, Trustees of Oldcastle Schools.

APPENDIX,  
No. 10.

## APPENDIX No. XI.

APPENDIX,  
No. 11.

REVISIONS OF SCHOOL BOOKS ON THE BOARD'S CATALOGUE. LETTERS TO THE RIGHT HON. EDWARD CARDWELL, M.P., Chief Secretary for Ireland. CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE COMMISSIONERS, 1859-1861.

(See Question 12383, page 123.—Mr. Kavanagh's Evidence.)

To the Right Hon. EDWARD CARDWELL, M.P.,  
Chief Secretary for Ireland

Endowed School, 32, Essex street,  
Dublin, July 25, 1861.

SIR,—I beg leave, most respectfully, to lay before you a copy of my correspondence with the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, on the subject of which I had the honour of addressing you some months ago, and which having now reached a *quasi terminus*, I am enabled duly to report progress, and offer my sincere thanks for the courtesy with which my appeal to you was received.

In my reply to the letter from the Education Office, addressed to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, 4th January, 1861, having corrected misstatements thereof, and repeated the grounds of my complaint, considering that I had discharged my public duty in the matter,—as *public Primæcipio*,—I deemed it not unbecoming me to accept the invitation of said letter, as to "personal acknowledgment of my services."

I, therefore, presented to the Commissioners a claim for the sum of one hundred pounds for those acknowledged "services."—a sum not disproportionate to the payment which I had received from a private publisher for corrections in one of these books—a sum not suggested by the curious history of the "First Book of Arithmetic," which, though current, is scarcely creditable,—namely, that it was purchased by the Commissioners, first, from one of their officers, at, of course, a handsome figure; secondly, at a cost of six hundred pounds, from a London house, which happened to have, as we Irish say, an earlier claim than that of the Board's ingenious compiler. And again, that some years subsequently, it was "revised and corrected" by one of the Board's professors, at the expense of another hundred pounds,—of which "revision" I have had cheerful occasion to give a character. Twice bought, and not well bought, twice revised, and not well revised.

After a considerable delay I was honoured with a letter, 5th April, 1861, from the Education Office, in which, for the first time, my "services" were denied, but my "trouble in the matter" acknowledged, and a "compromise" awarded me. Now, having presented a claim for my "services," not for my "trouble,"—trouble enough, indeed, I had, through a waste of the

discourtesy and injustice with which I was treated, in the name of the Commissioners,—and being unable, although a professor of Arithmetic, to see clearly the elements of this calculation for and "trouble," I declined accepting any portion of the educational funds for which I could not fill a satisfactory receipt.

I was told in this letter, that the Commissioners "had no idea of employing me" in the correction of the books which I had the honour of bringing under their notice. Now, if words are not to be taken à la Poltrover, I may refer any unsophisticated reader to the letter (No. 1) of the Commissioners to me, 20th November, 1859. I still believe that the Commissioners "had an idea" of so employing me, and I assert most truly, that, in effect, they did so employ me, although it may have been intended that another should enter into my labours. *Sic ut res volat.*

I would ask why had the Commissioners "no idea" of employing me. I had proved myself "the right man in the right place," I say it not with vain boasting, for I am assured that there are thousands of schoolmasters in Ireland, who would be as willing and competent to assist the Board, if enjoying the advantages of my position in this matter. I do not, indeed, know what "idea" on the subject were entertained at the Education Office, but this I know, that, regarding the Commission, not as private property, but as a great public trust, I felt that I had a public right to call attention to official neglect or misadventure; a right to offer, respectfully, my services, and a right to expect due acknowledgment for whatever services I might be able to render. And I now feel, that the neglect of my personal claim connected therewith, does not preclude my right and my duty, still to take an interest in the subject.

Having, in my letter to the Resident Commissioner, stated that the "public interest had been compromised in this matter," having, in my appeal to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, complained of a "public wrong," and, having, in my letter, 16th April, 1861, submitted from the Commissioners an investigation, "as of importance to the public interests," I feel quite assured, that the subject cannot be dismissed from further consideration.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

R. W. HENRY.  
S C

Appendix,  
No. 11.

No. 1.—To Mr. R. W. HEAL.

Office of National Education,  
29th November, 1859.

SIR,—Having laid before the Commissioners of National Education your letter of the 21st ultimo, they direct us to convey to you their thanks for having brought under their notice the subject to which your communication has reference.

The Commissioners are not, at present, prepared to rescind the "First Book of Arithmetic" and the "Key" to the same, but, as regards the correction of any errors in their publications, the Commissioners are always glad to consider suggestions to that effect, provided they are made by competent persons.

With reference to the list of errors contained in your letter, the Commissioners have directed that you be furnished with the latest editions of the Arithmetic and Key, and they will be happy to consider any inaccuracies contained therein, which may be pointed out, and to test such corrections as may be suggested.

We are, sir, your obedient servants,

MAURICE CROSS, }  
JAMES KELLY, } Secretaries

No. 2.—To the Right Hon. A. MACDONAGH.

32, Essex-street,  
24th August, 1860.

SIR,—I beg leave, most respectfully, to solicit your attention, as Resident Commissioner, and that of the other members of the Board of National Education, to the following statement:—

In reply to a communication which I had made to the Board, I received a letter from the Education Office, dated 29th November, 1859, and marked 6973/59, in which the Commissioners are pleased "to convey to me their thanks for having brought under their notice the subject of my communication, to direct that I be furnished with the latest editions of the First Book of Arithmetic and Key," and to say "that they would be happy to consider any inaccuracies contained therein, which may be pointed out, and to test such corrections as may be suggested."

In obedience to the wishes of the Board thus signified, I began made a careful examination of these books, and prepared, at considerable length, a list of errors and inaccuracies contained therein; which list, dated 20th December, 1859, accompanied with some requisite observations, I took to the Education Office, and handed to a gentleman who attended me by desire of Mr. Cross.

I naturally expected to be again favoured with some notice from the Commissioners—acquainting me that my corrections had been "tested"—were found inadmissible—required explanation—or, perhaps—were satisfactory, and adopted with due acknowledgment. But, now, after a suspense of eight months, I learn, with astonishment, that a new edition of these books, for 1860, has been issued, and that upwards of 500 corrections have been made therein, solely founded on my suggestions.

Having been treated so discourteously, I hesitate not to assert, that my experience and ability, in this department, are equal to those of any person whose services may have been preferred, and that, not only an injustice has been inflicted on me, by ignoring my well-earned claims to the superintendence of the revised edition, but the public interest has, in this matter, been compromised, for I am prepared to show, that the majority of the corrections now made, are not of the best possible style, that some are rather to be called inaccurate alterations than judicious corrections, and that, errors, to which my list had not alluded, are still unnoticed.

I am obliged to recollect that, on the occasion of my handing to Mr. Cross my first communication, he slightly said "that I wanted to be employed, but that these books had been revised lately, and by a professor too." I therefore took some pains, to get

copies of the older editions, and was able to remark, in my second letter to the Board, that the so-called revision amounted to this—removing two or three errors from a long list, and allowing twice as many new ones to creep in.

In conclusion, I beg leave to express my conviction, that the course adopted has not received the sanction of the Board, and that the Commissioners of National Education, to some of whom I have the honour to be personally known, would treat with consideration, in compensation for the efforts that have been made in which I sought to amend a school-book of the highest importance, by removing errors, inaccuracies, and improprieties, repeated in several editions for upwards of twenty years.

I have the honour to remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

R. W. HEAL.

No. 3. To the Right Hon. EDWARD CARMICHAEL, M.P.,  
Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Endowed School, 32, Essex-street,  
Dublin, 15th December, 1860.

SIR,—The more readily I beg leave to solicit your notice of a statement of individual grievances, in as much as the statement has reference to a subject of the highest importance, viz.—the faithful and judicious exercise of the powers entrusted to the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland.

Upwards of a year since I had the honour of addressing the Commissioners' observation to the following purport:—

That, having been engaged to supply corrections for a private edition of the National school-books, I had found in a very unsatisfactory state the First Book of Arithmetic, and Key to the same, published by the Commissioners for the use of inexperienced teachers.

That, the First Book of Arithmetic, ill suited to the wants of junior classes, was worthless for the instruction of higher classes, while at the same time, there was not on the Board's catalogue a good school-book of Arithmetic, this department of school business having of late years become of great moment.

That, the style of calculation taught in this book and key was not in any degree superior to that of the works of Voster and Gough, published in this country a century ago; and that errors and inaccuracies, to a great extent, were to be found in even the latest editions of these National school-books.

To these observations I added a brief reference to some inaccuracies and, most respectfully, placed at the disposal of the Board the best services of a lengthened experience.

The annexed printed copy (No. 2) of a letter which, some months subsequently, I felt it necessary to address to the Resident Commissioner, will explain the nature and extent of my complaint in this matter, a complaint which is much less an expression of personal feelings than resentment of a public wrong.

To this letter of remonstrance, written, as will be seen, in respectful terms, the Resident Commissioner has not vouchsafed even the formal acknowledgment of its receipt, and I am, therefore, obliged to appeal to a higher quarter for that redress which I vainly expected from the Commissioners.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,  
R. W. HEAL.

No. 4. To the Right Hon. EDWARD CARMICHAEL, M.P.,  
Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Office of National Education,  
4th January, 1861.

SIR,—With reference to the letter of Mr. R. W. Healy, addressed to you on the 15th ult., and forwarded by Mr. Butler to the Resident Commissioner for information, relative to a claim for certain corrections

tion in the First Book of Arithmetic, submitted by Mr. Hely for the consideration of the Board, in October, 1859.\*

We are to acquaint you that Mr. Hely never intimated in any of his communications to this department, that he was desirous of any pecuniary remuneration—all he seemed to wish for was a recognition of his services—and accordingly, the Commissioners directed an expression of thanks to be conveyed to him, which order was carried out by letter, dated 29th November, 1859.

We are also to state, that if Mr. Hely wish to obtain a pecuniary acknowledgment of his services, and will write to us to that effect, the Commissioners will give his application every consideration.

We beg to enclose Mr. Hely's letter, and have, &c

MAURICE CROSS, } Secretaries  
JAMES KELLY, }

No 5.—To the SECRETARIES, EDUCATION OFFICE  
32, Essex-street, Dublin,  
January 31, 1861.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to a letter of the 4th inst from the Education Office, addressed to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, a copy of which that right honorable gentleman has been pleased to transmit to me, I beg most respectfully to place before the Commissioners the following observations:—

This letter speaks of a claim as made by me, for corrections submitted to the Board in my communication of October, 1859, but I have not made any such claim. My first communication, of that date, was, I felt, sufficiently rewarded by the answer of 29th November, 1859, conveying to me the thanks of the Commissioners, "for having brought under their notice the subject of my communication."

My second communication, on which I do not say claim for public service, bears date 30th December, 1859. The Commissioners having, in their reply to my first communication, signified their willingness to consider the corrections of errors and inaccuracies, and having furnished me, therefore, with the latest editions of the two books to which I had made reference, I immediately prepared, for the consideration of the Board, numerous corrections for the First Book of Arithmetic, and for the Key to the same, the result of much attention given to the subject, in anticipation of the wisdom of the Board.

This communication, addressed as my former communication, must have come duly under notice, although I did not receive the usual official acknowledgment thereof, nor was it until after the issue of the new edition of these books, for 1860, that I was aware that my corrections had been, in their entirety, adopted by the Board.

I then deemed it my duty to forward to the Board, respectfully, a statement, which, under the circumstances, I thought proper to address, 24th August, 1860, to the Resident Commissioners; and notwithstanding informality, as it may have been, on my part, in so addressing the Board, I still feel, that to such a letter some notice was due by the right honorable gentleman, if it reached his hand, and that, if it did not, it should have been returned to me from the Education Office, with intimation of my error.

As to pecuniary acknowledgment of my services, I now beg leave,—availing myself of the invitation conveyed in the letter of the 4th inst. to the Chief Secretary, to present the Commissioners of National Education a claim for one hundred pounds.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary for me to say that I am precluded from legally demanding any acknowledgment of my services in the correction of these two books from the private publishers who reprint the Board's edition, and that, therefore, I have to look only to the

Board for consideration of public services which extend to a far wider circulation than even that of the National schools of Ireland.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

R. W. HELY.

No 6.—To Mr. R. W. HELY,

Office of National Education,  
5th April, 1861.

(FIRST ARITHMETIC.)

SIR,—The Commissioners of National Education having had under consideration your letter of the 31st January, claiming compensation for your trouble in pointing out certain errors in the First Book of Arithmetic:—

We are directed to state that the Commissioners had no idea of employing you to correct the work in question; but as they find you took some trouble in the matter, they have awarded you a sum of twenty pounds as a compliment.

We are, sir, &c

MAURICE CROSS, } Secretaries.  
JAMES KELLY, }

No 7.—To the SECRETARIES, EDUCATION OFFICE  
32, Essex-street, Dublin,  
April 10, 1861.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to a letter of 5th inst. from the Education Office, I beg leave humbly to say:—

That by their letter of 29th November, 1859, the Commissioners did employ me in the correction of the books which I had the honour of bringing under their notice—viz., the First Book of Arithmetic, and Key to the same.

That my communication of December 30, 1859, conveying the required corrections, was adopted by the Commissioners in its entirety; and that every correction—they being upwards of five hundred—in the edition of these books for 1860, is solely from my suggestion.

That I, most distinctly, made this claim in my statement, 24th August, 1860, to the Resident Commissioner, again in my statement of 15th December, 1859, to the Chief Secretary for Ireland; and again in my letter to the Commissioners of 31st January, 1861.

That I can also refer to one of the Commissioners, who did me the honour of urging me to forward the corrections as invited, and who, very recently, has been pleased to say that the Commissioners never did deny my services.

That declining to accept "as a compliment" the sum of twenty pounds, or any other sum, I most earnestly solicit from the Commissioners a thorough investigation of my claims for these services—an investigation which is absolutely necessary, in view of my professional character, and, at the same time, of considerable importance to the public interests.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

R. W. HELY.

No 8.—To the SECRETARIES, EDUCATION OFFICE  
32, Essex-street, Dublin,  
June 10, 1861.

GENTLEMEN,—I beg leave, most respectfully, to inquire whether a letter addressed by me to the Commissioners, 10th April last, has yet come under notice of the Board.

I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,

R. W. HELY.

\* Mr. Hely did not submit to the Board any corrections whatever in his communication of October, 1859.

† Communications are here acknowledged, but Mr. Hely's complaint is, that he did not receive any acknowledgment of his second or third communication to the Board, and was therefore obliged to address the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

‡ See letter No. 5.

APPENDIX,  
No. 11.No. 2.—To the SECRETARIES, EDUCATION OFFICE,  
32, BEAC STREET, DUBLIN,  
July 10, 1861.

GENTLEMEN,—I had the honour of addressing to the Commissioners of National Education, a letter, dated 10th April, 1861, and, not having received an official acknowledgment thereof, I addressed to you a letter of inquiry, dated 10th June, 1861, to which, also, I am yet without reply.

Desirous to be respectful in all my communications to the Board, I now beg leave again to inquire whether my said letter, of the 10th April, has reached the Office of Education.

I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,  
R. W. HELL.

No. 10.—To Mr. R. W. HELL,  
Office of National Education,  
15th July, 1861.

SIR,—The Commissioners of National Education, having had before them your letter of the 10th of April, direct us to inform you, that they do not consider they should order any investigation such as is requested by you in the communication. And the Commissioners further direct us to inform you that, under all the circumstances, they consider it to be their duty merely to repeat the offer made by the letter of the 5th of April, 1861.

We are, sir, your obedient servants,

MAURICE COOKE, } Secretaries  
JAMES KELLY, }

APPENDIX,  
No. 12.

## APPENDIX No. XII.

## PROGRAMME OF PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION for ADMISSION to the ALBERT INSTITUTION, GLASSFORTH.

Conducted by the District Inspector, on Friday, 23d May, 1866

[See Question 12935, p. 361—Mr. Baldwin's Evidence.]

The Inspector will please attach this Form to the Examination Papers of such Candidates.

District No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Candidate's Name, \_\_\_\_\_  
(To be written in full)  
Religion, \_\_\_\_\_  
School where educated, \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Patron, \_\_\_\_\_  
Post Town, \_\_\_\_\_

## RESULTS OF EXAMINATION.

a. The District Inspectors are to assign the mark for Reading only.

b. The answers are to be forwarded to the Education Office on the day following the examination.

c. The written exercises will be marked at the Education Office.

Time allowed for each subject.	Highest marks obtainable.	Subjects.	Value of Exemption.
A few minutes for each Candidate, 1/2 an hour.	70	Reading: a passage in the Fourth Book of Lamentations.	
	60	Pennmanship (to be judged from the written papers generally, and from a line of large and a line of small hand).	
1 "	50	Diction and Spelling: a few passages sent home with.	
1 hour,	60	Grammar,	
1 "	50	Geography,	
1 "	100	Arithmetic,	
1 "	40	Book-keeping,	
1 "	60	Geometry and Mensuration,	
1 "	100	Agriculture,	
Total,	600		

Observations (to be made by the Inspector) as to the Candidate's physical capacity for farm labour, and his fitness, generally, for admission to the Albert Institution.

Signature, \_\_\_\_\_ District Inspector.

## GRAMMAR.

Parse the following sentence:—

1. This little rill that from the springs of yonder grove its current brings, plays on the slope awhile.

2. Give the name of the opposite gender of each of the following words—*deaf, ear, July, see, niece, creature*.

3. Write out the positive form of each of the following words—*first, fast, west, least, best*.

4. What distinction would you draw between a principal and an auxiliary verb? Name the auxiliary verbs.

5. What determines the case of the noun or pronoun which answers a question?—Give examples.

6. Correct the following errors, giving in each case the reason for the correction:—

\* If the Candidate's parent is the applicant, please to state his name and address.

- Those who has known his services one and kin
- Who will I give them slaves to
- Rebecca took goodly raiment and put them on Jacob
- Plausure, and not wealth, were his object

## GEOGRAPHY.

- What is meant by a great circle of the globe? and name four of the most important parallels of latitude generally marked on a map of the world.
- Name the chief mountain ranges of Europe; give their general directions, and the principal rivers which rise in each.
- Refer the following to their respective countries, stating what each is:—The Hague, Appendix, Andorra, Hocha, Negropont, Bakal, Auckland, Pines, Tiber, Melbourne, Wandermare, New Orleans.
- Assign to their respective countries the following towns:—Cookhill, Llaner, Holywood, Foyon, Balthoro, Lishorn, Goshality, Killybegon, Chillinghol, Omagh, Parnocrovia, Gomer, Callan and Meenabath.
- Describe the position of Ireland, and give its area and population; also mention its principal exports, and its mineral productions.

## ARITHMETIC.

No credit will be given for an answer unless the work be set out in full.

- Express in figures seventy millions one thousand and eleven, and divide it by thirty thousand and fifty.
- Reduce 331,346 inches to miles.
- Divide 15½ by 12, and add ¾ to the quotient.
- Find the difference between 9½ guineas and £4 3½.
- Reduce 35a 3s. 30r Irish to statute measure, and calculate the rest at £2 4s 8d per statute acre.
- How much oats at 17s 8d per barrel must I give for 52 barrels of wheat at 27s 6d per barrel so as to gain 5 per cent by the exchange?
- A can do a piece of work in 12 days, A and B together in 8 days, in what time would B alone do it?
- A bankrupt pays 2s 8d in the pound, and the total of his payments amounts to 2760 12s; what is his debt?
- Purchased £35 12s worth of wheat at 34s 6d per barrel, part of which being damaged was lost, for the remainder, which was sold at 20 per cent profit, I received £38 12s; how many barrels were lost?

## GEOMETRY AND MEASUREMENT.

- Give Euclid's definition of a plane rectilineal angle and define opposite angles, vertical angles, alternate and adjacent angles; also state on what does the magnitude of an angle depend?

2. Prove that triangles upon equal bases and between the same parallels are equal to one another?

3. What is the area of a field in the form of a trapezoid, one of the diagonals measuring 1,368 links, and the perpendicular to that diagonal from the opposite angles being 946 links and 849 links?

4. The diameter of a circle is 595, what is the side of the circumscribed square?

5. Required the cost of excavating the drains of 4a. 3r., at 4d. per cubic yard; the drains being 27 feet apart, 15 inches wide at top, 6 inches at bottom, and 60 inches deep.

## BOOK-KEEPING.

1. Explain the uses of the following books: Waste Book, Journal, Ledger.

2. In journalizing repeat the rules for making proper Drs. and Crs.

3. What is meant by "Posting"?

4. How would you enter in the Ledger the following entry:—

M. Nolan, Dr.	
To Goods,	£50
" Cash,	70
	—120

5. I find on examining my books that £50 worth of Linz sold to William Wilson on the 5th of March, was placed to the account of Richard Joyce. How is the error rectified?

## AGRICULTURE.

1. Describe the changes that take place in the decomposition of farmyard manure.

2. Explain the statement that phosphoric acid is the weaker link in the chain of the soil's fertility.

3. In the Norfolk four-course, what is the quantity of phosphoric acid per acre sold off the land in corn?

4. Describe, and state the uses of the implement known as Turner's grubber.

5. Why is it necessary to introduce a "crack" into the common harrow?

6. State the objects and advantages of the saddle harrow.

7. Give the quantity of seeds required for the following crops:—

Maize and vernal,  
Swede turnip,  
Yellow turnip,  
Carrots.

8. How would you manage so as to have flix raised once in ten years in the Northumberland five-course rotation?

9. Describe the practice of "crossing" live stock; and name the breed of cattle best adapted for improving, by "crossing," the cattle of this country.

10. What do you consider a good average yield of a milk cow for the twelve months, supposing her to be fairly fed?

APPENDIX,  
No. 12.

## APPENDIX No. XIII.

EXTRACT FROM LETTER OF E. HODGKIN, Esq., Secretary to Board of Public Works, dated 10th December, 1868.

[See Question 30467, page 888—Mr. De Vere's Evidence.]

The cause of the delay in this case (Kilbrann National school, county Limerick), as well as in some others in the same district, was the neglect of the district clerk of works to furnish the required plan and estimate, notwithstanding repeated reminders.

The Board had, in consequence of these delays, called on him to resign his appointment two years since, but in consideration of the great amount of duty he had to perform, and his previous services under the Board of National Education—from which department he was transferred on this Board, taking over the charge of the buildings connected with it—the Board,

at his urgent solicitation, granted him a further trial, at the same time transferring him to a district of lesser extent, which the appointment of an additional district clerk of works enabled them to do.

The Board, however, although he somewhat improved, did not receive the reports &c., on the Kilbrann school until the 10th October last, and they have decided that they can no longer retain his services. I have to add that the plan and report on the school in question are at present before the Board of Education since the 3rd instant.

APPENDIX,  
No. 13.

## APPENDIX No. XIV.

RULES AND DIRECTIONS for the REGULATION of the GRAMMAR SCHOOL in the TOWN of ELPHIN, in the COUNTY of ROSCOMMON, established in pursuance of the TRUSTS of BISHOP HODSON'S WILL, as settled and approved of by ORDER of the HIGH COURT of CHANCERY in IRELAND, bearing date the 18th day of February, 1867.

[See Question 30468, page 914—Evidence of the Very Rev. Wm. Warburton, A.B., Dean of Elphin.]

1. That a school-house having been erected in the town of Elphin, by and out of the funds of this charity, a school for boys shall be established and carried on in said school-house, for the benefit of the inhabitants of said town and immediate neighbourhood.

2. That pursuant to the directions in the will of Bishop Hodson, the founder of said school, the governing body having the oversight of said school shall be composed of the bishop of the diocese—that is to say, the bishop for the time being of the United Diocese of Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh, and of the Dean of Elphin for the time being, and of the several persons for the time being members of the Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Elphin.

3. That the place of meeting of such governing body shall be either the said school-house or the chapter-room of the Cathedral of Elphin, and their meetings

shall be either on fixed days or as occasion shall require, according as it may seem right to the aforesaid governors to appoint.

4. That at all meetings the person present highest in ecclesiastical rank shall take the chair, and such chairman shall have a vote as if not in the chair, and in case of equality of votes, shall have a second and casting vote.

5. That except in the cases provided for by the 19th clause, three members of said governing body shall constitute a quorum.

6. That a list of the children admitted into the school shall be kept by the head master, and that such list shall specify the parentage of each child, the time of admission, the age when admitted, and whether such child is educated gratis or not.

7. That the admission of children to said school, and

APPENDIX,  
No. 14.

APPROVED,  
No. 14.

the terms on which they shall be admitted, shall be in the discretion of said governing body.

8 That in any rules which they shall make as to admission, provision shall be made for the free and gratuitous education of children whose parents are too poor to afford to pay for their education.

9 That the governors may, in their discretion, at any time, remove from the school any child guilty of misconduct, or suffering from infectious disease, or for irregular attendance.

10 That the governors shall have power to fix, and from time to time to vary and regulate the payments to be made for the education of children not educated gratuitously, and the application of such payments.

11 That the governors shall have power to appoint one head master, and if the circumstances of the school shall appear to them at any time to call for a second master, also a second or assistant master, and that the nomination of such masters respectively shall be regulated by the governors, subject, however, to any provisions in that behalf made in these rules.

12 That the governors shall have power in their discretion to revoke and deprive of his office any master, provided that the Bishop of the diocese shall concur in such removal and deprivation.

13 That the head master shall not receive any child into the said school not admitted by the governors, and shall not receive any payment or recompense for the education of any child admitted to be educated gratis, nor any other payment or recompense for the education of any child than shall be allowed by the governors.

14 That the duties of the head master shall be to teach the children attending the said school spelling, reading, writing, arithmetic, plain geometry, navigation, English grammar, English history, and if required by the governors, the Greek and Latin languages, to such of the children as they shall from time to time deem likely to be benefited by such instruction, and shall direct to be so instructed, and such other branches of education, including modern languages, as the governing body shall from time to time direct, and that the duties of the assistant master, if one shall be appointed, shall be to assist the head master in his said duties, in such manner and to such extent as shall be directed by the governors.

15 That except during holidays the said school shall be open from half past nine o'clock in the morning until twelve o'clock, noon, and from half past twelve o'clock until three o'clock in the afternoon, but it is hereby provided that the governors shall have power, from time to time, to alter the said hours of attendance to any other hours of attendance that shall seem to them more suitable.

16 That in every year there shall be a vacation at Christmas not exceeding three weeks, and a vacation at Michaelmas of three weeks, to be fixed from time to time by the governors, with power for the governors to extend the Michaelmas vacation for a further period not exceeding one fortnight, and that there shall in addition be allowed as holidays, Good Friday and the days intervening between that day and Thursday in Easter week, and Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in Whitsun week, the Queen's birthday, and any other day in the year appointed for a public fast or thanksgiving.

17 That once or oftener in every year an exami-  
nation of the children attending such school shall be held at such time or times as the governors shall from time to time appoint, and that it shall be lawful for the said governors to confer rewards or prizes on

such child or children as shall be deemed deserving at such examinations.

18 That every head master and assistant master shall, on his election and before admission to his office, sign a memorandum to the effect following, that is to say:—"I, having been appointed master, or assistant master, as the case may be, of the Grammar School of the town of Elphin, do hereby undertake to perform faithfully and diligently the duties of such office in such manner as the governors shall from time to time appoint; and I undertake not to receive, directly or indirectly, any payment or recompense from any scholar in the said school, other than the stipend authorized by the governors, and I undertake, immediately on my discharge from such office by the said governors, to quit and deliver up to them, or any person or persons to be appointed by them, the school-house, buildings and premises, and all the property belonging to the said school of which I shall or may be in possession as master of the said school, and should I neglect or refuse to deliver up such possession of the said school-house, buildings, premises, and things, or any of them, the said governors may, or any person or persons whom they may appoint, may, without any proceeding at law, or in equity, enter into and upon, and take possession of the same, or as much thereof as possession of, shall not have been given by me as aforesaid. Witness my hand this day of

19 That the moiety of the rents of the lands donated by Bishop Holston to the establishment of the said Grammar School, shall be applied by the governors, for the time being, of the said school, and applicable by them to the objects hereinafter specified. In the first place, in payment of the rent, rates, and taxes of the school buildings; and in the next place, in keeping the school buildings insured against loss or damage by fire, to the amount of £650, and in annually painting, keeping in repair and good order the school and other buildings which have been erected; and in the next place, in payment of the salary of the head master, and also of the salary of the assistant master, if a second master shall be employed, and in providing the said school with requisites, and in the last place, in providing rewards and prizes for the children at the said examinations, in conformity with Rule No. 17; and for distribution of the fund for the purposes aforesaid, and the making of any rules in connection therewith, not less than five governors shall form a quorum, of whom the Lord Bishop of the diocese, for the time being, and the Dean of Elphin shall form two.

20 That an account shall be kept of the annual rents and expenditures of the said school, and deposited in the Chapter-house of the said Dean and Chapter.

21 That it shall be lawful for the governors, if they think it expedient, from time to time, to place the school as established in connection with the National Board of Education for Ireland, as a non-voted school, so as to obtain thereby the benefit of inspection and assistance in books from said Board, and for that purpose to make any changes in the rules and regulations hereby made which shall be requisite, and it shall also be lawful for the governors, if it shall at any time or times afterwards appear expedient to them so to do, from time to time, to remove said school from connection with the said Board.

22 That this scheme shall be printed, and a copy thereof given to each governor from time to time, and to every trustee for the time being of the said constituting the trust.



## APPENDIX No. XV.

## LETTER from the Rev. R. McMorris.

(See Questions 22679, page 928—Evidence of The Rev. John McMenamin, &amp;c.)

Major Cunningham, Co. Donegal,  
Feb. 22nd, 1869.

The Rev. Dr. Wilson.

DEAR SIR,—I have heard with great surprise that it has been testified before the Royal Commission that I, whilst professing to favour a unified system of education, got up a new school, thus acting diametrically, when previous to its establishment there were two schools within an Irish mile of each other, and that it was planned between them.

I affirm that this is neither a fair nor a full representation of the case, and I feel aggrieved by it.

I submit the following facts:—

1. There was a large district with a diameter of four Irish miles, in which there was no National school, a vast waste made S.R. by the people.

2. An effort was made in 1855 to get up a new school for the district. Ample parents and friends volunteered freely. A site could not then be obtained, as the proprietors were hostile to the National system. Efforts were repeatedly made for ten years without success.

3. When Sir J. Hill came of age and visited his property in the district in 1853, his tenants told him of this deep want, and these repeated efforts. He with generous liberality then offered to build a house, and selected the most suitable site on his property, where four roads meet. All this was done without any consultation of any kind with me, and as far as I know, without any desire to interfere with existing schools.

4. At that time, one of three existing schools referred to in the evidence above quoted was situated (where it had been for at least ten years) at a very considerable distance from its present site, and also from our new school. It was afterwards removed to a house built at the very verge of Sir J. Hill's property, and built after he had finished his

new house, but before our school could be received by the Board.

5. Opposition was then given to the reception of our new school under the Board. The Local Inspector, himself a Roman Catholic, when he visited the locality to make his report, and examined the whole case, said—"there is room enough for all," and our school was received accordingly.

6. Our new school-house, built by Sir J. Hill, remains on his property. I am simply sitting by request as local manager. Although I was not consulted about the site, I believe it to be the best that was available. The school was very much needed, and has always been well attended, as the subsequent statistics show. I may add, that on two sides of our school the nearest National school is  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{4}$  miles respectively.

7. Presbyterian children in considerable numbers continue to attend the other two schools under Roman Catholic management with my active approval.

I am and have always been a consistent advocate of united education, and would dread and deprecate the introduction of anything involving denominational education.

GLENNAGHY NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Manager,  
Rev. R. McMorris.

Average, 1868, first quarter after being opened:—

	On rolls, 51-
	Present, 46-4
Dec. 1867, first quarter.—	On rolls, 66-4
	Present, 55-3
Dec. 1868, first quarter.—	On rolls, 53-7
	Present, 40-2

I am, yours, very truly,

R. McMorris, Presbyterian Minister.

Sworn before me this 22nd February, 1869.

Wm. Thompson, J.P., City of Derry.

## LETTER from the Rev. O. LUTCH.

Lettistown, February 23rd, 1869.

My dear Sir,—The school recently established by me is situated in Curryville—distinct from this town about three miles—and my reason, expecting what you inquire, for establishing it was simply the educational requirements of the locality. There it and there has been for several years no school of any kind within three or four miles of the immediate from which, I expect, the children attending the new school will be principally drawn. The result is such as might be anticipated. A good many families living in the district have grown up to be young men and women without having acquired the rudiments of the elementary education. I am very to my instances of the kind are to be met with in families connected with my own congregation. Finding, however, this to be the case, I considered it to be my duty to use every exertion in my power to build a school-house in the place and set a school in operation. I am happy to say I have at length realised my wish. The school was opened on the first of the

present month, and, judging from the attendance, it is a great success. The house is already completely filled, and the children belong to every denomination of Christian living in the district. The numbers on the roll up to the present date are 45, and only three denominationally do closed—12 Established Church, 14 Roman Catholic, and 19 Presbyterian. You will at once perceive that this is a very good sample of a mixed or non-sectarian school. There is no undue preponderance of any one denomination, but each is fairly represented. I may add, Roman Catholic parents as well as Protestant parents freely volunteered in order to purchase school requisites, such as desks, &c. They also assisted, when called on, in getting the building materials. The necessary funds for the building I provided myself independent of the people.

Faithfully,

O. LUTCH.

The Rev. Dr. Wilson.

STATEMENT of Rev. R. BEATTIE, CONVOY, of the Number of Children on the Rolls of National Schools and the Number present on — February, 1869, according to Religious Denomination in National Schools, referred to by the Rev. J. McMENAMIN in his evidence on the 4th day of December, 1868.

NATIONAL SCHOOLS in neighbourhood of CONVOY, with Numbers on Rolls and Numbers present, February 22nd or 23rd, 1869—of different Denominations.

1st. CONVOY.	
Presbyterians,	39 on rolls, 21 present.
Established Church,	16 " 15 "
Roman Catholics,	8 " 5 "

Rev. R. BEATTIE, Manager.

22nd February, 1869.

2nd. DERRY.	
Presbyterians,	10 on rolls, 8 present.
Established Church,	" " "
Roman Catholics,	60 " 39 "

Rev. Mr. McMENAMIN, Manager.

Visited 22nd February, 1869.

CARRIGROVE.	
Presbyterians,	63 on rolls, 39 present.
Established Church,	8 " " "
Roman Catholics,	" " " "

Rev. R. BEATTIE, Manager.

Visited 22nd February, 1869.

REARLY.	
Presbyterians,	10 on rolls, 2 present.
Established Church,	7 " 9 "
Roman Catholics,	95 " 55 "

Rev. Mr. McMENAMIN, Manager.

Visited 22nd February, 1869.

## APPENDIX,

No. 12.

GLASNEAGHVA.		
Presbyterianism,	23 on rolls,	45 percent
Established Church,	9 " 7 "	
Roman Catholics,	57 " 28 "	

Rev. Mr. McMENAMIN, Manager

Visited 23rd February, 1892.

ASKEWATE.		
Presbyterianism,	54 on rolls,	43 percent
Established Church,	22 " 14 "	
Roman Catholics,	14 " 10 "	

Rev. S. MARTIN, Manager, 2-C Canal

Visited 23rd February, 1892

## LANNIN.

Presbyterianism,	12 on rolls,	6 percent
Established Church,	1 " 1 "	
Roman Catholics,	74 " 39 "	

Rev. Mr. McMENAMIN, Manager

Visited 22nd February, 1892

(Signed) R. BAXTER

## APPENDIX No. XVI.

## APPENDIX,

No. 16.

REPORT of J. W. KAVANAGH, Esq., (formerly) Head Inspector under the Board of National Education, on Clonmel Model School for the year 1891, referred to in his Evidence—Question 22286, page 976.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT on the CLONMEL DISTRICT  
Head Inspector of

MODEL SCHOOLS, by JAMES W. KAVANAGH, Esq.,  
National Schools

Clonmel, April 5th, 1892.

GENTLEMEN,—I have the honour to submit for the information of the Commissioners this, my Third Annual Report, on the Clonmel District Model Schools.

Having, in the Reports for 1849 and 1856, given a detailed statement of the buildings; the accommodation for pupils and for pupil-teachers; the course of instruction and occupation of time in the several departments; the staff of teachers, pupil-teachers, and paid assistants; the arrangement for religious instruction; and the opinions of the local clergy of all denominations in relation to the practical working thereof; the mixture of social ranks, and of religious denominations in the schools; the rates of school-fees, and the incomes of the teachers; the influence the schools have exercised in improving the efficiency of the several National and other schools in the town and neighbourhood, and in elevating the social position of the teacher; and having in the last Report given a full outline of the entire course of English, mathematical, scientific, and industrial education which we aim at imparting, whenever the accommodation for the pupils shall be properly extended, I shall on this occasion refer to those Reports for this information, and confine my present statement to such points only as are of more special interest, or such as are necessary to record the progress of the establishment during the past year.

*Buildings and School Accommodation.*—The schools, from the period of their opening, had an attendance, at least in the boys' and in the girls' schools, far beyond what they were designed to accommodate; and two rooms in the domestic establishment have since been used as additional temporary school-rooms. Even this arrangement provides quite insufficient room, and such use is attended with loss of time, interference with discipline, imperfect cleanliness and ventilation, and the rooms being remote from the schools, withdraws the pupils from the central superintendence of the head teachers. In summer 1890 the schools were visited by the Archbishop of Dublin, and on that occasion I had the honour to point out these defects to his Grace, and at his request to forward to him a report on the subject, which report, I was led to understand, his Grace was pleased to recommend to the favourable consideration of the Commissioners for their adoption. The Board's architect and I were then instructed to arrange a meeting at the schools, in order to consider the means of extending them, and after an inspection of the premises, I forwarded my report to the office, and the architect also submitted his plans on the subject. The year 1890 passed on, and the crowded rooms, unventilated houses, and unfinished play-grounds still continued; the Commissioners, as I understand, deeming the expense of the proposed plans too great, and desiring to farther test their necessity in the permanent success of the schools. From week to week Dr. Clarke, the District Inspector, continued to report

the inconvenience felt from the state of the schools and premises, and in November last, Mr. Cross, one of the Board's secretaries, Mr. Darley, architect, and I, went to Clonmel for the purpose of inspecting the designed extension of the buildings, and that Mr. Cross might, from the state of the schools, be able to report to the Commissioners on the propriety of carrying out the proposed plans.

My recommendations respecting the extension of the buildings are—that the boys' school room be increased to double its present length, and have a classroom added, so as to afford, in both, accommodation to 200 boys; that the girls' room be lengthened, and have a class-room (to serve also as a work-room) added, so as to accommodate 140 girls; that the infants' room remain as it is; that the internal communication between the three schools be closed; that the master's parlour and the study-room be thrown into one school-room for a Classical and a senior class, and in the mornings and evenings to serve as a study-room for the pupil-teachers; that a short wing be added to the west of the house, containing a good parlour for the head master, and above, two bed-rooms for him, that his present bed-room, &c., be fitted up, so as to provide dormitories for a total number of sixteen pupil-teachers, that a small sitting-room be furnished for the second master, that the play-grounds be extended, levelled, and completely finished; that the grounds and premises be enclosed by railing, and the lawn tastefully laid out and planted; that a small nest garden be built in front, and that the field opposite the house be taken and laid out in a neat garden to supply vegetables, &c., to the establishment, and in which the pupil-teachers might occasionally work, both for recreation and instruction. I trust that the Commissioners may be pleased to direct steps to be taken which will insure the completion of these improvements before the close of the present year.

*Number and Attendance of Pupils.*—In my last Report I stated that the number on the roll in the boys' school had been fixed at 140, and I have now to report that, during the entire year, the average number was 158, the vacations, and a slight falling off in January and December, causing a decrease of two in the year's average, the average number on the roll of the girls' school was ninety-three, and in the infants' school seventy-nine, or a total of 310 as compared with 300 in the year 1890. This exhibits the fixed and permanent character of the schools, and the estimation in which they continue to be held by the parents and the public, and the regularity of the pupils' daily attendance being so the average eighty-three present out of every 100 on the rolls, or probably as in 1890, shows that the rules on this head have been carried out in a similar manner, and with similar results. The percentage of attendance for each 100 children on the rolls was, in the boys' ninety-five, girls eighty-five, and infants' school seventy-seven, which must be regarded as remarkably high, especially that

is the boys' school. The following table shows the numbers, &c., at different periods:—

	On Tenth Day 10/17, 1918	On Ninth Day 10/16, 1918	On Eighth Day 10/15, 1918	On Seventh Day 10/14, 1918	On Sixth Day 10/13, 1918	On Fifth Day 10/12, 1918	On Fourth Day 10/11, 1918	On Third Day 10/10, 1918	On Second Day 10/9, 1918	On First Day 10/8, 1918	On Tenth Day 10/17, 1918
Boys School	100	180	184	190	224	120	215	215	215	215	215
Girls School	30	200	98	210	60	80	20	20	20	20	20
Industrial School	60	100	40	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Total	190	380	282	380	304	220	315	315	315	315	315

The large number of admissions and discharges chiefly relates to the pupils paying a penny per week, as in default of payment a single week their names are struck off the roll, and should they again apply for readmission, they must be admitted as new pupils, thus increasing the trouble of keeping accounts and swelling the numbers of admissions and discharges in the year. In last report I showed why the numbers on the rolls on the 31st December afford no correct idea of the state of the schools, and I now beg to refer to the averages for the year as the true test of their numerical prosperity.

**Social Classes and Rates of Payment.**—In Appendix A will be found the occupations of the parents of the pupils who were on the school rolls at any time during 1881. This table exhibits a similar mixture of social classes to that referred to in former reports—the children of clergymen, barristers, attorneys, engineers, excise and other public officers, merchants, ex-managers, shopkeepers, farmers, tradesmen, labourers, &c., in fact every social grade in the town.

The proportions of pupils paying 5s. and 2s. 6d. per quarter, and paying 1d. per week, have been maintained in conformity with the scale laid down in last report, the fees for the past year in each school having amounted as follows:—

	Amount of Interest 1934.			Grand Total Interest including half cent			Interest expended for 1934.			Amount of Interest expended for 1935.		
	\$	¢	d.	\$	¢	d.	\$	¢	d.	\$	¢	d.
Day School	18	3	6	465	1	3				34	18	4
Night School	48	19	3	875	34	1	25	9				
Infants' School	13	15	3	164	28	1				6	24	10
Total	135	4	10	1444	33	5	195	5	3	40	15	14

It is very gratifying to notice that the amount of school fees here tabulated exceeds that prescribed in the regulations laid down in 1849 by the Commissioners, by taking the average number on the roll of each school, and dividing this number in the proportions suggested to the several rates of payment, the aggregate annual fund should be £130 6s., or about £3 less than the sum actually received. Further, assuming the schools to accommodate 520 pupils, as perhaps designed, the fund received would by £18 those which, under the Board's scale, would be received from that number.

The same mixture of children of all the religious denominations in Clontarf, as reported on former occasions, continues to attend the model schools, and the same unbroken harmony and good feeling continue to mark their mutual intercourse. During the year the properties of children of the several communions remained as in 1850, two Gaudi Roman Catholics, and six-third Protestants, including members of the Established Church, Presbyterians of the Synod of Ulster, Unitarians, Christian Evidents and Separatists. It has already been explained that the number on the rolls at the end of the year is considerably less than the average number on the rolls during the year; and

far, however, as the present question is concerned, this difference merely diminishes the absolute numbers of children of each denomination, leaving the *ratio* between them unaltered. The following table exhibits the numbers on the religious instruction rolls of the model schools at the periods set forth:—

Demographics	Number of People on School Rollo, Dec. 1961		
	1945	1960	1961
Roman Catholics	312	815	174
Evangelical Church	40	20	22
Presbyterian	10	0	0
Unitarian	1	0	0
Christian Brethren	1	100	0
Seventh-day Adventists	0	0	0
	364	935	196

The arrangements entered into by the several clergymen for giving religious instruction continue unaltered since they were made at the opening of the schools. These are, that the first half hour of the first two days of the week shall be devoted to the separate religious instruction of the children in rooms provided for each denomination, and that on Fridays the morning instruction be given by the respective clergymen for one hour to the children of their own communions. The clergymen who unanimously agreed to these arrangements, were the two parish priests of Clonsilla, the Very Rev. Dr Burke, v.d., and Rev. J. Baldwin, Rev. Mr. Croity, c.c., Rev. John Dill, Presbyterian Minister, and Rev. James Orr, Unitarian Minister; and although not present at the opening of the schools, and not having attended for about a year to take any part in giving religious instruction, the rector, Rev. J. B. Palliser, has, on several occasions, expressed his entire concurrence in the arrangements which he found existing, and to the practical working of which he has since his first visit given most active and anxious co-operation. On Friday morning, Rev. Mr. Palliser, on one of his lectures, Rev. Mr. Baldwin, on one or two of his courses, Rev. Mr. Dill, and Rev. Mr. Orr, attended to instruct or examine the children of their several communions, and to ascertain the proficiency made by the children during the previous week's instruction, under the teachers and assistants of their respective parishes. In addition to their visit on Fridays, all the clergymen are accustomed to visit occasionally at the time of religious instruction on the other mornings, as the teachers, while so engaged, are merely as their deputies, and under their exclusive control and direction. From the opening of the schools, up to the past summer, the Sisters of Charity, from the convent in the parish adjoining that in which the model schools are situated, were accustomed to visit and give religious instruction to the Roman Catholic girls on Fridays, owing, however, to the demands on their time from other duties, they have discontinued their attendance, intimating the cause in a note addressed to Rev. Mr. Baldwin. The progress made by the children in religious instruction, during the past year, is most favourably spoken of by the several clergymen, Rev. Mr. Palliser, Rev. Mr. Baldwin, Rev. J. Dill, and Rev. Mr. Orr; all equally testifying the zeal and attention of the teachers, pupil-teachers, and assistants in carrying out their instructions on this important head.

[The following portion contained within [ ] was not published by the Commissioners of National Education in their Report for 1851.]

[And I beg leave to further observe, that at the Roman Catholic Bishop's personal visitation last July the answering of the Catholic pupils of the model schools, at the examination held in St. Mary's parish, was such as to call forth the marked approbation of his lordship, the Right Rev. Dr. Moran.]

\* Exclusive of furnished apartments, fuel, and light, £20 for a servant for general attendance, a small profit on pupils' board, and an acre and a half of land rent free, in all £120 per annum.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. Mr. Dill and Rev. Mr. Gre both considered themselves as members of the school.

On the soul and attention of Miss Bayard in the daily instruction of the company class of Presbyterians and Unitarians

APPENDIX,  
No. 16.

The question of model schools having been a subject of discussion in a few localities in Ireland, I trust it may not be out of place here to make a few observations on the matter. The objections to model schools consist chiefly of two classes—those opposed to mixed or united education, and those who, while favourable to, or at least would tolerate mixed education, are opposed to the special management of model schools. Although the second class of objections have used great pains to bring forth the differences between the ordinary National schools and the model schools, it will, I apprehend, eventually be found that their celebration of the National system, so far as it seems mixed or united education, is entirely wrong, and not sincere; and, therefore, that there is no reality in the one class of objections to the model schools. It is quite true that the several model schools—both literary and combined literary and agricultural, and whether metropolitan and central, or provincial and local—are under the exclusive management of the Commissioners; but it is equally true that the Commissioners neither assume nor claim any privilege or authority over those schools beyond that which their rules and regulations grant to the manager of an ordinary National school. When a stonemason, or a landlord, or a committee raises, by subscription or otherwise, one-third of the expense necessary to erect, with the aid of the Government grant, a mixed National school, or when any of these parties provide a *non-vested* house for the purposes of a National school, how are we unreasonable in to deny the right, of the stonemason, or the landlord, or the committee to appoint, or to remove the teacher, the right to prescribe the course of instruction that shall be followed, or to make the several other regulations necessary for the maintenance of the school. In the exercise of these rights there is, however, due restriction, and which forms the fundamental principle of the present system of education, that the consistency and religious principles of the parents of the children to be taught and sincerely respected, not only as to religious instruction, but even as to the use of every book to be used in the weekly instruction of the school. In the ordinary schools not only is the use of no book published or approved of by the Commissioners prohibited, but further, the use of any such books is prohibited in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to its being so used. These regulations, which have been so often set forth and dwelt upon in the reports of the Board, and which are approved to be put on as well as put in practice in every National school, are those which, without education or modification, are carried out in the model schools, conducted under the Commissioners in their managers. In some of the model schools, the Scriptures extra are read, and in others, in Church, they are not, the parents of most of the children objecting to their use. In the selection of teachers for their model schools, the Commissioners have over wisely consulted the particular circumstances of each locality, and made the appointment in accordance therewith. In Clonsilla the headmaster is a Roman Catholic, the second master of the Established Church, the mistress of the girls' school a Catholic, of the infants' school a Presbyterian, twelve of the pupil-teachers and paid mistresses are Catholics, two are of the Established Church, and two are Presbyterians. In Dunsany model school both the head master and the head mistress are Catholics, the second master and the agricultural being of the Established Church, and in the literary department of the agricultural model schools of Woodstock (Kilberry), Derryville (Hipperry), Terenure and Mount Treacher (Lansrick), and Farnham and Glenduff (Cork) all the teachers are Roman Catholics, there being scarcely any children of any other persuasion in the neighbourhood. The practice of the Commissioners has been similar throughout Ireland, the appointment of teachers to the several schools under their own management being made, as far as possible, in conformity with the special circumstances of each locality, and twenty years' exercise of their trust in this respect, and the remarkable amount of public confidence that has been bestowed on each of the schools, must, to every one not the slave of prejudice and prejudice, form a presumption of such moral weight as to be fully equal to any legal security that the practice which has been attended with such success will not, while the present National system lives, be in any way altered. About 130 of the 1600 parishes of Ireland have their schools in connection with the National Board, and were five of the curate priests have their schools also receiving aid in books and in position, and although the Board of Guardians of the former, and the governors of the latter, too frequently show only a very moderate degree of skill and judgment in the selection of teachers, and in the management of the educational department of those institutions, yet the objections to the Commissioners' exercise of similar functions in their own few schools—some of the objections being persons connected with both parishes and workhouses—have never publicly questioned the right of

those bodies to act as managers of National schools, almost every one of which is attended by pupils of more than one religious denomination, and therefore mixed schools. In the south of Ireland, and in every part of it, there are numbers of liberal landholders who themselves or their agents are managers of National schools, and it is highly creditable to all of them that in the appointment of teachers—and which right they generally reserve to themselves—they invariably act in the same spirit as the Commissioners, selecting those only who, from their religion and general character, would be fit instruments in securing public confidence, both on the part of the parents and of the clergy. This is the policy of the Devonshire, the Landowners, the Devons, the Fortresses, the Bishops, the Clergy, the Clerks, the Landowners, Montagu, and scores of peers, baronets, and men of rank. The objection, if of any weight, which lies against the exercise of management of a National school on the part of the Commissioners, applies with far greater force to such exercise by mixed bodies constituted like the Boards of Priests and the Boards of Guardians, and should further be extended to the members of benevolent and liberal bodies to whom I have alluded, who have erected schools as their property, have endowed them liberally, and who manage them in strict accordance with the rules of the Board. This statement should satisfy any enlightened mind that the few schools established at the sole expense of the Board within the last five or six years differ in no respect as to their rules and regulations as to the questions of religious instruction, books, and appointment of teachers from any schools which now are or were heretofore in connection with the National system, and that the Commissioners, as managers of those few schools, superintend them with no additional power or privilege beyond those always assumed by individual managers, whether clerical or lay, of whatever creed, or by mixed bodies as committees, Trust Boards, or Boards of Guardians. Being really opposed to mixed education, and knowing that the model schools, when even established, have to a greater or less extent secured mixed education, the parties favourable to these schools first argue that they are as a different plan, or combined under different rules, from the ordinary National schools, to which, under particular circumstances, they state they are not opposed. Then they state that they are a new feature in the system altogether, next, that it is the commencement of a scheme to supersede the ordinary schools under local management; and finally, that from the amount of direct Government patronage thus created, they are likely to be made subservient to arbitrary power, and thus pervert civil and religious liberty. With the first of these objections I have fully dealt, and the second and third require but a brief statement of facts. From the establishment of the National system the Board have had eleven in Merrion-street (1837) or in Marlborough-street several and training schools, and these are in operation are the largest of their kind in the world. From the first the Commissioners nominated the professors, teachers, and other officers of these departments, nor has there ever been any complaint on that ground so much as there could be of their right to appoint their managers, their trustees, or their clerks. At these model schools over one-third of the National teachers through Ireland have been trained, and of the seven grades of salaries to them the highest three can be obtained by such teachers only as have passed through the training department in Dublin. So early as 1840, or when the National system had been only three years in operation, the want of preparatory model and training schools had been felt, and the Commissioners, in their second report (dated June, 1833) to Earl Mulgrave, then Lord Lieutenant, set forth various replies to seven questions transmitted to them by the Exchequer, and in the last of these questions I beg leave to draw attention. "Fifth Query.—What extension can be given to the new system of education consistently with the demand for instruction, and with due regard to the preparation necessary for training schoolmasters, upon whose reliance can be placed, in respect to competency, character, and discipline; and what amount of funds may be annually expended beneficially by the State for that purpose?" After describing the qualifications requisite to form a good and efficient teacher, and having set forth the several provisions which it would be desirable to establish in the Central Training Institution, the Commissioners state—"We are of opinion that in addition to the general training institution, thirty-two distinct model schools should be established, being a number equal to that of the counties of Ireland, that these model schools should be under the direction of teachers chosen for special attainment, and receiving superior remuneration to those charged with the general or primary schools, and that secondary schools should be added for the training schoolmasters should undergo a preparatory training in one of them." Further, the Commissioners in the same report submitted an estimate

of the expense of the erection of these thirty-two model schools within two years, as also for their permanent annual support. Thus, it is evident that the local model schools instead of being a new idea, or a new feature in the National system, had from the beginning been the means to which the Commissioners looked, and on which they confidently relied for giving completeness and unity to their system of training teachers; and it may not be unworthy of notice that one of the first attacks made on the scheme was by the Bishop of Exeter in a speech in the House of Lords a few months after its promulgation, while within two months of the issuing of Lord Stanley's letter, empowering the constitution of the National Board, Dr. Doyle forwarded a circular instructing his clergy to place their schools under the new Board, and in which his lordship states—"The role which requires that all teachers heretofore to be employed be provided from some model school with a certificate of their competence, will not in a work of great difficulty, to wit, that of suppressing hedge schools, and placing youth under the direction of competent teachers, and of those only." The fact that the model schools are only a first step towards gradually supplanting schools under local management could not be entertained by any person who understands the object and expense of these establishments, or who has read the Sixteenth or Seventeenth Reports of the Commissioners, in which detailed accounts of the working of six of these are given by the Head Inspectors. Those schools cost the State in their erection about £4,000 each, and for their annual maintenance about £200 each, and actions as the Commissioners have been for the last seventeen years to establish one in each school district (now fifty-four) the demands on their funds have yet enabled them to erect only two of them, in addition to those others, sites for which have been selected, and the buildings of which are about to be commenced. Perhaps the most remarkable result that has arisen in connection with some of the model schools, as Clarendon and Donnybrook, is, that instead of requiring much less expending the existing National schools under local management, they have in each case most materially improved them in number of pupils, and in efficiency, as may be seen in the reports on both model schools. The last objection to be noticed is the danger that is apprehended to the preservation and extension of civil liberty from the increased patronage which these establishments will throw into the hands of the Government, and which a minority might use to aid the establishment of arbitrary power. Of the Parliamentary grant of £120,000 the entire expense of these officers reaching above £50 a year, and who are appointed directly by the Board, does not amount to £20,000, fully two-thirds of the entire annual grant being given in salaries, and which are under local control. From the establishment of the National system no Government has ever sought to control the appointment of the officers or to interfere with the general proceedings of the Commissioners. In the evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Education, the late Right Honourable A. R. Blake, a member of the National Board, replies as follows:—"Question 1457.—Does the Board appoint its officers?—It does. 1458.—Does the Lord Lieutenant in any degree control the appointments?—Not in the slightest degree. 1459.—Would it not be an eligible arrangement that no person should present himself for examination who could not produce certificates of having studied some particular course which should be prescribed by the Board?—Hereafter we expect to have our system established and conducted that we should be able to make all the highest appointments from persons already in our service, as persons we could not do that. 1460.—You do not intend it [persons] to become a matter of Government patronage?—We do not in general arrangements with the Government about anything except where it is necessary to get a change in the plan that may require acceptance? Those candidates not only explain the only, but also solve the management of the Government as to the National system, and to the appointments made under it, and further it may be observed that of those that have been promoted from the rank of teacher to situations in the local and the central model schools, and to positions on the inspection staff, almost all of these held situations under local patronage through the process, and the Commissioners even at so intended, but, unfortunately of often knowing it of no mind, public opinion in any respect. Frequent allusion is made to the danger to constitutional liberty from the continual system of public instruction, whereas the salutary system of education which prevails in some European states are not available not the cause of these despotic governments, and experience proves that the spread of education even so legitimate freedom. In America, where so great an amount of national liberty prevails, instead of weakening the con-

nection between the state and the school, the central studies of the great Republic are leading those closer and closer to concrete and national dependence, and even in England the opinion generally obtains that the efficiency of the school should form the measure of evenness of the suffrage. Having then noticed the leading objections made by some persons against the model schools, I shall now state that this must be the place to discuss the real question at issue in the controversy, and that to which these objections must give way, namely, national education being secured in the model schools should their extension or that spread be necessarily opposed."

**Literary Instruction.—Boys' School.**—During the past year I visited and examined the boys' school at various times, and although on no occasion able to complete an entire examination of all the classes in all the subjects taught, yet on the whole I was always able to form a correct estimate of the general progress attained in the several branches. The private examination held during the entire week previous to the public examination in July last, by Dr. Clarke and Mr. Stoney, District Inspectors, and by myself, enabled us to ascertain the individual progress of every pupil in the several subjects of study, as it was on this examination we awarded the premiums to those pupils whose proficiency and answering were most distinguished. We had reason to feel perfectly satisfied with the general result of the examination, and with the progress which had been made in the several branches during the previous year, and so equal were the attainments of large classes in some of the subjects, that the selection of the best answer in each was frequently a prolonged and difficult task. It was only within the past year that we were able to form a fifth (on highest) class, so that the classification is now complete, and extends to the most advanced of the Board's class books. The entire 140 boys write on paper; all of them learn grammar, including 119 who can parse; 82 write from dictation; all learn mental arithmetic, including 81 who are in beyond proportion; all learn geography, including 60 who learn globes; 72 learn measurement and geometry, and about 49 have gone over three books of Euclid; 18 learn book-keeping and also algebra; all learn to sing in parts, and the senior class is acquainted with the principles of music; 56 practice drawing from models; the senior class joins the master and pupil teachers in practical surveying in the field, and are also taught the use of the ordinary mathematical instruments in mapping and plotting the actual surveyors' class mode; and 60 boys of the upper classes are instructed by Dr. Clarke in the principles of natural philosophy, and in their application to the purposes of the arts and manufactures. I beg leave to refer to the accompanying report, by Dr. Clarke, on the subjects which formed the matter of his instruction for the past year, and on the proficiency attained in each; and I would especially request the attention of the Commissioners to the questions put to the pupils of Dr. Clarke's class, at the examination for a silver medal, awarded by him last summer. Those questions form but a security index either to the extent or to the depth and accuracy of the pupils' acquaintance with the leading branches of physics, of experimental science, or of the application of chemistry, geology, mechanics, &c., to industrial and manufacturing purposes. Whether as to number and extent of scientific subjects of similar character, or as to their practical bearing on the purposes of life, there is no such range of instruction given in any school, or even college in Ireland, and of this every intelligent person who witnesses an examination of the pupils must soon feel satisfied.

**Girls' School.**—A class in the Girls' Reading Book has been formed within the past year, and the pupils of the two upper classes read the Selections from the British Poets. About 30 girls pass, in arithmetic 35 are learning or have learned proportion, 48 write from dictation, the entire school sing in parts; and the senior classes learn the elementary theory of music; 40 draw from models; all the girls sew, 60 knit, 40 cut out plain garments and do sew, and are engaged at various branches of embroidery, and in cro-

\* The schools are inspected and examined one day in each week by Dr. Clarke, District Inspector.

APPENDIX.  
No. 16.

chest, rug, Berlin, and other work. The girls, like the boys' school, was examined by me at various times when I visited during the year, but the private examination of the several classes for premiums, afforded me the best opportunity of testing the individual and collective proficiency of the pupils. The result of the examination was on the whole quite satisfactory, and afforded proof of successful industry and zeal, both on the part of teachers and pupils, during the previous year.

*Infants' School*.—The range of subjects here being limited, required only little formal examination, and on reading, spelling, writing, tables, and geography chiefly in natural history and other subjects, the children show great general intelligence, and in singing, marching, and bodily exercises, it is most gratifying to witness the success that has attended Miss Bryant's training of the little ones. Nor are the more grown children confined to lessons suited only to mere infants, as many of them read with fluency, write fully, and their minds undergo such active development, that on being transferred at the proper age to other the boys' or to the girls' school, they soon find their class fellows in all the branches of instruction.

*Public Examination*.—The annual public examination of the three schools was held by Dr. Clarke and myself, on the 30th and 31st July. Messrs. Graham, Deane, and Blosdy, District Inspectors of schools, being also present. The school-rooms being too small, and wholly unsuited to accommodate the public on such an occasion, were most inconveniently crowded, although every precaution was taken to afford the greatest amount of room, and for this purpose only the single class under examination was allowed into the room at once. The attendance of the clergy, gentry, corporation, mercantile classes, and parents of the children, was even more numerous than in 1850, and numbers remained in the halls in the hope that when changing from one school-room to another they might secure a place so as to hear the examination. Many persons came from Waterford to attend the examination, amongst whom were Dean Hoare, and several Quakers. Amongst those present were Lady Osborne, Northwester, and friends; Sir Walsby the Mayor of Clonmel; Lieut. Col. and Mrs. Plappe and family; Percy Gough, esq., &c., the Hon. Mr. Gough; Dean Hoare, Waterford; Rev. J. B. Palliser, rector of Clonmel; Rev. John Biddens, &c., St. Mary's; Rev. John Dill, Presbyterian Minister, Rev. James Orr, Unitarian Minister; Rev. Mr. Murray, &c.; Rev. J. Power, &c.; Alderman Hackett, &c.; Alderman Flesher, &c.; Barrows Kelly, esq., Barrister; W. L. Hackett, esq.; Bristow, Dr. Flynn, Resident Physician to the Lunatic Asylum; Capt. Hennesworth, County Inspector of police; Dr. Scully, Physician to the Workhouse; Dr. Small, Physician to the County Gaol; Mr. Jones, County Surveyor; Bartholomew, esq.; W. Davis, esq.; Messrs. Gabb, &c., &c. A full list of the names of those who attended would include a transcript of the leading professional men, public officers, and the mercantile classes in Clonmel without distinction of creed or of politics. The examinations lasted two days, and from 11 to 5 o'clock on each day—the boys' school occupying one day, and the girls' and infants' school the chief part of the other. Recitation from the Selections of the British Poets, &c., mental arithmetic, geography, and nomenclature, formed the chief of the ordinary school subjects upon which the boys were examined. Their penmanship, including their book-keeping exercises, was inspected; then progress in drawing from models was witnessed in their examination on the principles of perspective by the drawing master, and from the number of well executed subjects drawn by the boys, and which were hung round the walls, maps, and computations of actual surveys, made on portions of property in the neighbourhood, were also exhibited, and were much admired; and besides the part-singing at various times during the two days by the boys and girls, the singing master examined the chorists on the leading principles of music. It was explained to the audience that a pre-

vise congregation of the pupils had been held, in order to ascertain the most distinguished in each class, with a view to present them with premiums, but that beyond that no special preparation to any extent had been made for the public examination; and further, the disingenuous and others were invited to mark, within the proficiency of each class, any branch of its subject upon which they desired that the boys should be examined. The visitors appeared highly pleased with the conversant and attainment of the boys in all the subjects which the short time permitted us to enter on, and a more cheerful and gratifying scene could scarcely be imagined than the bright countenances and rapturous looks of the parents as their children or relatives warmed in the intellectual struggles with their class-fellows. The examination of Dr. Clarke's class excited the liveliest interest; and in order to exhibit the thorough knowledge of the boys, copies of a programme of the various branches of natural philosophy, chemistry, geology, and of manufacturing industry, which had been studied within the year, were put into the hands of several of the visitors, and they selected therefrom those that they deemed as subjects for examination. Rev. Mr. Palliser, Colonel Plappe, and others, successively selected the manufacture of glass, the steam engine, the barometer, geology, &c., and with the small working steam-engine, the working model engine, and the sectional models, the boys gave a thorough exposition of the important subject of the steam-engine, and similarly from fastenings, instruments, models, geological and mineral specimens, raw materials and their manufactured products, each subject named was examined on by Dr. Clarke, the boys illustrating their answers from the objects before them when necessary. To prevent misapprehension and disappointment, I explained to the audience that this was the only model school in Ireland in which such instruction was given, and that although the Commissioners gave a small grant to aid it, the splendid collection of instruments, specimens, &c., with which they were then surrounded, is the private property of Dr. Clarke, and that this instruction has been given chiefly after school hours, and at times attended by him from the ordinary and tedious duties of his situation as Inspector of schools in one of the largest districts in Ireland; and further, that surprised and gratified as the parents and public were with the results of Dr. Clarke's disinterested exertions for the young people of Clonmel, there is at present no security for a continuance of such instruction to them. This explanation drew forth an animated conversation, in which some of the principal visitors stated that persons in other towns who had read the reports on the Clonmel Model Schools certainly expected that, should their localities be favoured with an extension of similar institutions to them, they would regard the scheme of education as wholly incomplete without Dr. Clarke's instruction as a permanent branch in it; and they urged the utility of extending such practical and industrial knowledge to all the model schools.

In the girls' school the public examination was quite as satisfactory to its extent as in the boys' school. The girls read much better, wrote better, and, all circumstances considered, exhibit in other branches as gratifying proficiency as the boys. Many of them show a decided taste for drawing, and some of their productions were greatly admired. Their plain and fine needlework, knitting, &c., were laid out in a separate room, and contained a very varied assortment of elegant specimens of skill and finish in the several departments, and the execution of which was greatly complemented by the ladies who were present. Lady Osborne, assisted by a lady of ladies, whose counsel she sought, after careful examination of the work, pronounced the specimens in the various branches which, from their simplicity, deserved premiums. In addition to arithmetic, geography, grammar, &c., the singing of the girls afforded much gratification; and all the senior classes, and the chorists, are able to sing in parts any ordinary melody, or piece of music, at sight.

The examination of the infants excited much public

interest. Their recitation of suitable poetic pieces, their answering in geography, natural history, and on subjects of general information derived from the lessons on objects which are given, could not fail to excite the gratification of the parents and the public. The cheerful and happy faces of the children; the courteous neatness and cleanliness of their persons and dresses; their lively songs and orderly and spirited march, quite astonished those who had for the first time visited; and whether seen in the gallery at lesson, or in the play-ground at their varied amusements, it would be difficult to imagine a scene on earth more suggestive of unalloyed human happiness.

At the close of each day, after the examinations, the boys, girls, and infants, all assembled in one of the play-grounds, and for some minutes the boys went through some marching and other exercises in presence of the visitors. Under the direction of Mr. Washington, the senior pupils sang a selection of appropriate songs from the National melodies and other sources, and the proceedings terminated by all the pupils singing the anthem, "God save the Queen." Much credit is due to Mr. Washington for his success, not merely in teaching his singing classes, but also for the efficient assistance rendered by him to the head-master in the discipline and order required during the days of the examination.

**Prizes.**—The Commissioners granted £10 last year towards premiums for the most deserving pupils, and these consisted chiefly of books, work-boxes, &c. The books were chiefly of a scientific character, and were submitted for the approval of the clergymen, before distribution. Each book contained a printed label, on which were set forth the name of the pupil, the subject for which it was awarded, and the names of the examiners, with their seals affixed. As a more portable testimonial, and one which hereafter may be used as a valuable recommendation of a boy through life, we also presented a handsome parchment certificate of similar character to each boy or girl who obtained a book, work-box, &c., and as frequently there was only a slight shade of merit between the best and the second best in a class, we awarded one of these as a certificate of honour to the latter. There were also presented by Dr. Clarke and myself two very handsome silver medals to the two boys who had most distinguished themselves in their studies. At the close of the proceedings on the second day, the list of successful candidates in the three schools was read before the public, and as the several parties presented themselves they were greeted with the warm and loud applause of the audience and of their school-fellows.

From the late hour, and the room being distressingly crowded, it would be impossible to go through the ceremony of presenting the premiums to all. Lady Osborne, however, was pleased to kindly make some of the duty, and, prefaced by a short complimentary address to each pupil, her ladyship invested the two boys with the silver medals, and also presented two of the girls with very handsome work-boxes. Next day the remainder of the premiums were presented to the pupils by the Rev. Mr. Baldwin, &c., and the Rev. Mr. Ogle, a very large number of the parents being in attendance.

**Pupil-Teachers and Paid Monitorers.**—The course of studies, occupation of time, dietary, domestic life, general studies, and number of the pupil-teachers on these the same as reported on former occasions. We have had some difficulty in finding candidates fully qualified in every respect to fill the vacancies in the pupil-teachership according as these occur. Up to this date we have had thirteen pupil-teachers in training, including eight who are at present in the establishment completing their term. Of the eleven who have been trained two (Protestants) have been appointed second masters in the model schools in Chancel and Dunsbury, their places being worth £20 a year; two are on the Special Class in the Central Training Establishment, and are likely to get charge of superior schools; two are masters of National schools in the town (convenient to the model school), and are in

the receipt of incomes of £50 and £35; four others are in charge of good National schools; and the eleventh, or remaining young man, emigrated with his father, who was also a National teacher. Thus it appears that ten of the eleven are in the public service, and all of them are most favourably reported on, both by the managers and the inspectors, for their good conduct and general efficiency. Of the eight at present in training six are Roman Catholics, one of the Established Church, and one is a Presbyterian; all were pupils in National schools, two were paid monitorers, and six were pupils in the model school itself. Owing to the poverty of the country the pupils seldom remain at the ordinary schools to such an age, or till they are so advanced, as to afford a suitable class from which to select promising paid monitorers. This circumstance obliges the District Inspectors to appoint boys who are in too many cases far below the prescribed attainments, and thus a very few of them turn out to be of qualifications or capacity which would warrant us in nominating them to the vacant pupil-teacherships, as was previously intended. This paucity of suitable candidates must soon become embarrassing unless steps are taken to provide a remedy, and already the result is that in Chancel the brothers and some of the best men, the grandsons of clergymen, the sons and daughters of comfortable shopkeepers and higher mechanics, are the principal candidates for the pupil-teachership and monitorships in the model schools. A continuance of this state of things would give the model schools an isolated and narrow character, instead of having them centres upon which all the schools of the district would be affiliated; and instead of drawing into them the chief teaching capacity of the latter, and returning it back to the same sources, improved and cultivated for the general good, would limit the supply of candidate teachers to the pupils of the model schools themselves; and to not even the entire of these, but to those alone whose circumstances would enable them to remain at school to the age of sixteen years, or above it. This would practically exclude the humble artisans from the promotion afforded under the National system, and throw it almost exclusively into the hands of those in more affluent station; but what is of equal importance, it would deprive the nation of the talent, virtue, and ability which numbers amongst these artisans would naturally supply to the ranks of the teachers. It must be a matter of deep gratification to the Commissioners to learn, that while three years ago the three National schools in Chancel were attended by only the very humblest social grade in the town, and not one of whom paid a farthing for their education, that now, through the influence of the model schools alone, the social position of teachers and the character of the National system are so raised that parents in some of the highest stations in the town not only send their children to the model and other National schools, but that many of them even seek for the lowest situations in them for their children. Intended, however, for the education of the millions, the National schoolmaster should be wisely taken from these sources, but be the best of his class and order, and it is now for the Board to consider how far the advanced and depressed state of the country have tended, in the absence of some new provision to render such selection difficult, if not impossible.

The proficiency of the pupil-teachers in their studies, and their conduct and attention during the year, were highly satisfactory; and their respective clergymen have several times spoken to me in the most favourable manner of their attention to their religious duties, and of the efficient aid they have given them in imparting religious instruction in the schools. Their health has been also remarkably good during the period.

Of the eight paid monitorers all have been pupils in the schools, six are Roman Catholics, one of the Established Church, and one a Presbyterian. Thirteen only, including those now in office, have been appointed from the opening of the schools; and of the five who left one is in charge of an important National school, under the Right Rev. Dr. Delany, in the city of Cork;

APPENDIX,  
No. 16.

our is in a National school in this district; one had to join her brother as housekeeper; one emigrated with her family; and one is assisting in her father's National school. According to their four years of office expiry, or earlier if fully grown, we shall have no difficulty in providing them with situations in schools, as the managers evince a great desire to secure the services of persons so trained. The two female teachers report favourably of the conduct and attention of the institution, and their proficiency in their course of study is satisfactory.

*Native Graduate Teachers*.—From the opening of the schools we have trained and instructed seven very respectable young women, who were admitted as candidates at the request and on the recommendation of several clergymen. They cost the Commissioners nothing, being merely allowed to witness the mode of conducting the girls' and infants' schools; and when sufficiently qualified, were given the charge of classes under the direction of the teachers. Six of the seven have been provided with situations in good National schools, two of them being at present in training in Dublin, and the seventh will soon get an appointment to the charge of a school. These young persons are giving the fullest satisfaction to the managers and to the inspectors; and without incurring expense to the State, six respectable teachers have been provided for National schools. Three young men who had been extern candidates have also got charge of National schools.

*Visitors*.—The number of visitors to the model schools during the year was very considerable, and their reports of the school highly satisfactory. Amongst some of those who visited may be mentioned—Lady Osborne, the Right Hon. W. F. F. Tigue, Lieutenant of Kilkenny; Daniel Osborne, esq., M.P.; N. V. Mahon, esq., M.P.; A. O'Flaherty, esq., M.P.; Francis Scully, esq., M.P.; John Bagwell, esq., M.P.; R. Musgrave, esq., M.P.; Stephen Moore, esq., M.P.; Dr. Mallock, Roman Catholic Bishop, Newfoundland; Sir Thomas Denham, Rev. Messrs. Nelligan, Clonmanga, Alexander, &c.; Charles Hancock, esq.; Stewart Blaker, esq.; numerous bodies of Quakers from England, Waterford, &c. Mr. Coon, one of the secretaries to the Commissioners, visited in November last, and heard several classes enounced in the boys' school, and also inspected the other schools, the domestic establishment, and the premises generally. He appeared to be greatly pleased with his visit, and complimented the teachers on the state of their schools.

*Influence of the Clonmel Model Schools on the state of Education*.—During the year 1861 I visited the cities of Limerick, Waterford, and Kilkenny with a view to assist in the selection of a site for a model school in each; and the most active and influential of the local parties in these cities avowed me that it was the reports of the remarkable success of the Clonmel model schools which mainly led to their desire to secure similar advantages for their own localities. The adequacy of the National system to the wants of the middle and larger classes, has been tested in giving a higher and more practical education to their children; and if the Commissioners be pleased to add a classified branch to their present schools in Clonmel, it will give completeness to the scheme, and be competent to prepare young men to enter schools and colleges of a higher character. Several of the leading men in the town have spoken to me on the subject, and as the proposed school lies among them the addition of such a branch would nearly afford a good salary to the teacher, the expense to the Board would be very trifling.

Attracted by the success of the model schools, to which they are frequent visitors, the Society of Friends or Quakers in Clonmel have spread through their reports to the members of their community in England and Ireland such a spirit for educational inquiry that numbers of their body have especially visited the town in order to witness the mode in which the schools are conducted. At their request I visited their large boarding-school for boys in Waterford, and at the desire of the committee of the establishment, the teachers have since spent some time in observing the

system pursued in Clonmel. I know of no body of men in the country that evince a higher desire to promote education than several of the Quakers in Clonmel, and a new school for the young ladies of their community built, but not yet opened in the town, is wholly under their superintendence to become one of the first private schools in which the National system, so far as its books, improved methods of teaching, &c. are concerned, will be practically adopted. Some of the pupil-teachers of the model school who are now in charge of National schools in the town are employed as private tutors in the families of Quakers.

It may be necessary to repeat what was before stated in former reports that the borough of Clonmel, with a population of 13,000 persons, has extensive schools, with four spacious rooms conducted by the Christian Brothers, large schools for infant and grown girls under the Sister of Charity, those being attended by none but Roman Catholics; Protestant parochial schools for boys, girls, and infants under the rectors' superintendence; a small school for girls, founded by a Miss Grubb, and which, with the rectors' school, are attended almost exclusively by Protestants; an endowed classical school, and two private classical schools; and two private schools for girls able to pay moderate school-fee. Of National schools there are two for boys under Rev. Mr. Baldwin's patronage, and taught by two young men who had been pupil-teachers in the model schools; and a girls' school, with two spacious rooms, conducted by the ladies of the Presentation Convent, which, as well as the two boys' schools, are in Rev. Mr. Baldwin's parish, and quite convenient to the model schools. In the eastern side of the town there are two National schools, a day and an evening, held in the Mechanics' Institution, and which were called into existence by the public attention which the model schools caused to be given to education. The day school is attended by about sixty boys, and like the model schools, these include every grade from the public officer or medical man, with an income of £300 a year, to the son of the day-labourer. The rates of payment are 6s. or 2s. 6d. per quarter, or 1d. per week, and the fees last year amounted to £20. Of the twenty boys sixty-four are Roman Catholics, twenty of the Established Church, two Presbyterians, and five Baptists. The evening school is attended by fifty-eight pupils, including policemen, clerks, tradesmen, apprentices, &c., who are employed during the day, and like the day school pupils, they all pay moderate rates for their tuition, and they include a similar union of different religious denominations. Here, then, are three schools, boys', girls', and infants', opened under the Commissioners in 1849, in a town appearing to already abound with educational institutions; these schools are at once not merely filled, but crowded, and in addition two other National schools are opened, and these also secure a numerous attendance. One schilling was not paid for tuition in a single National or other public school in the town, unless education was unknown, and the attempt to secure the attendance of children of different social grades in the same school was treated as perfectly Utopian. Including the model schools, of the eight National schools in the town, five are an perfect types of mixed education, both as to *circles* and to *classes*, as the Commissioners could desire, and six of the eight are pay schools, with a receipt from school-fee of close on £300 a year; one of the two free schools being under terms, who, from their principles, could not accept any fee for tuition.

The workhouse National school has perhaps of the awakened educational spirit, and the Guardians evince an earnest desire to have it one of the most efficient of its kind in Ireland. They have lately got a female teacher from the model school in Dublin; one of the assistant schoolmasters had been a pupil-teacher in Clonmel; and over the industrial department they have placed an agriculturist from the model farm, Glacerrin.

Not are the National schools the only ones that have been improved by the attention drawn to the model schools. The habits of order, punctuality and regu-



lucy of attendance, readiness to purchase a supply of books, personal cleanliness, payment of fees, &c. which have been attained, prove to the managers of other schools, that results such as were deemed impossible, may be attained; and that while the fullest opportunities for education should be thrown open to the poor, both parents and children will find that being obliged to exercise a moderate degree of forethought and self-denial in overcoming those obstacles, will eventually prove the best training for their children and themselves. As stated in my last report, we have never allowed any spirit of hostility or antagonism to associate itself with the model schools in relation to the denominational schools in the town; we have had the Sisters of Charity aiding in giving religious instruction; the Protestant minister sends one of his teachers to the model schools to be trained; and the Christian Brothers, both of Clonsilla and other towns, have been cordially welcomed as visitors.

All the teachers, without exception, have given us the highest satisfaction in the discharge of their several duties; and during the year nothing occurred to disturb the harmony and good feeling between them.

To the several clergymen, Rev. Mr. Palliser, Rev. Mr. Baldwin, Rev. Mr. Dill, and Rev. Mr. Orr, I beg to tender my most sincere gratitude for the kind interest they have manifested in the general welfare of the schools, and especially for the regularity of their attendance in giving, or in directing, the religious instruction of the children of their respective communities.

I have the honour to remain, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH, Head Inspector.

The Secretaries, Education Office, Dublin.

APPENDIX,  
No. 10.

#### APPENDIX No. XVII.

UNPUBLISHED PORTION OF MR. KESSEY'S REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1858, WITH THE MINUTES OF BOARD, &c., relative to same.

APPENDIX,  
No. 17.

[Referred to in the Evidence of the Right Hon. A. Macdonnell, questions 22947, page 1031, and in the evidence of W. H. Newell, esq., A.B., questions 24632, page 1343, and questions 24724, page 1107.]

1. Extract (unpublished) from General Report of P. J. Kessy, esq. for the year 1858, relative to the inadequacy of the existing Training Department for the wants of the country, and proposing the addition of training departments to the district model schools, and the establishment of non-vested model schools, as means towards rectifying the deficiency.

2. Also minute of Board thereon.

Training.—The only branch of the National system which is really inadequate to the wants of the country, is that recognised as the Training Department, and of all the agencies in operation in the system, this department is, perhaps, by far the most vital and important.

Of the 1,055 teachers in my circuit, only 60 per cent. of the masters, and 49.8 per cent. of the mistresses have been trained. A large number of untrained, and, in many instances, poorly qualified persons are therefore in charge of schools. For the supply of trained teachers we are dependent upon one local establishment, which is plainly incongruous to the wants of between five and six thousand schools. It may be said that the model schools are so many training schools, producing every year large numbers of skilful masters and mistresses, but the fact is, that we profess to prepare only monitors and pupil-teachers in these institutions. In some of the model schools the monitors and pupil-teachers attain to a high order of skill and education, but training in the strict and comprehensive sense of the term is not attempted. I am of opinion, however, that it ought. I think that each of our model schools ought to be a training school, an institution in which a person could receive the philosophical and professional training requisite to make him an accomplished teacher. The major object of training pupil-teachers and monitors, I would hand over entirely, as is done in England and other countries, to the masters and mistresses of good ordinary National schools. Nor would I confine the training of teachers to institutions belonging exclusively to the State, and wholly governed or managed by the Commissioners.

Perhaps I may be permitted to advance a reason or two for entertaining this view. In the first place, the model schools are anything but equally distributed over the face of the country; and experience shows that their influence does not travel much beyond the limits of the districts in which they are situated. For instance, there are at present, to my recollection, ten districts, thirty-wise teachers who had been pupil-teachers or monitors in model schools, and thirty-one of them are employed in the only districts, Tully and Ballymore, in which there are model schools, whilst the remote districts of Westport, Swinford, and Roscommon, having 231 schools in them, are without a

single ex-pupil-teacher or monitor of a model school. It is plain that besides the inequality of their distribution, the number of existing model schools is wholly inadequate to the wants of the country. I would, therefore, leave it to private enterprise to extend the number of such institutions, to establish them wherever philanthropy would suggest or local circumstances show, that they might be required. By opening up in this manner the model school system, the field of their development would be widened, and their usefulness and efficiency materially promoted. The literature of education would also, I conceive, derive incalculable advantage from the adoption of this plan. Public officials, especially in Ireland, and under such a system as ours, are scarcely at liberty to enter upon the speculative and debatable questions involved in the discussion of the science of education. The arrangements of non-vested model schools would submit first to such endorsements, and, from the competition which local enterprises would doubtless inspire, an extensive and valuable literature—reports, essays, and school manuals might annually be expected to emanate.

The details of the practical working of the scheme could be easily regulated.

In the district model schools there would be very little occasion for a change of arrangements. Additional documents, &c., would have to be provided, so as to accommodate eighteen or twenty students in each school. The only increase to the existing staff of officers which it would be necessary to make would be the appointment in each school of a training master, who should also be lecturer on the principal branches of science and literature, and be head of the whole institution. The scholarships or places should, except in rare cases, be open to persons who would have completed their period of service in ordinary National schools. The course of training should extend to three years, and for each year there should be a closely defined amount of business to be performed. The district model schools alone would, I estimate, produce about thirty fully trained teachers annually.

In respect to the constitution of the non-vested model schools, I would suggest a very simple code of regulations. As in the case of an ordinary National school, a non-vested model school should, during school hours, be open to children of all persuasions, and (providently in any form) should be rendered impossible; but the boarding and lodging of the students, being a private undertaking, might be conducted on whatever principle and discipline, moral and religious, the promoters of the school might choose to adopt. To obtain for a school the rank of a "non-vested model school" it should be only necessary to show that its resources

APPENDIX,  
No. 17.

would be equal to the task of training up teachers; that its attendance, mechanical appliances, and organization would be ample enough and complete enough to afford the students opportunities of practicing the art of teaching; that its conductors would have the requisite scholarship and skill to instruct the students; and that suitable accommodation should exist for the lodging and boarding of the inmates. The minimum number of students to constitute a non-vested model school might be fixed at eighteen or twenty, and should the number fall below the minimum no recognition should be made of the establishment beyond that of any ordinary National school. An examination of the students should be held once a year, and a grant of some fixed sum, by way of reimbursement to the expenses of the school, should be made for each student whose answering would be satisfactory. The grant for each student might correspond in amount to the sum expended on a student in one of our own model schools, which would be about £20. For very superior merit I would, however, add to the grant a few pounds available to the student himself. In concluding my observations on this important suggestion, I beg to urge its adoption by the Commissioners on the double ground of creating a stimulus to thought and action in the working out of the practical details of education, and of supplying a great want, which, owing

to our inadequate means of training teachers, would otherwise long remain an imperfection in the National system.

EXTRACT from the MINUTES of the BOARD of NATIONAL EDUCATION, dated 2nd December, 1859.

Present — Right Hon. M. Brady, Lord Chancellor; Marquis of Kildare; Sir T. N. Biddings, K.C.B.; Robert Andrews, Esq.; James Gibson, Esq.; Right Hon. J. Hatchell; Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.

The Secretary lays before the Commissioners Mr. Keenan's report, proposed to be included in the Appendix to the Twenty-fifth Report, and calls attention to the passage at page 183-4, designated "training."

Ordered—That the passage read, be expunged, and that Mr. Thom be authorised to cancel the sheet in which it is contained, it appearing to the Commissioners that the plan proposed by Mr. Keenan for the establishment of non-vested model schools involves an organic change in the system.

The Commissioners also decline to sanction Mr. Keenan's further proposal that the present district model schools should be altered in their constitution, so as to serve as training schools for National teachers in addition to the other objects they were designed to carry out.

APPENDIX,  
No. 18.

# APPENDIX No. XVIII.

[See Mr. Keenan's evidence, questions 12205, 12210, page 510.]

COMMISSIONERS between ARCHDEACON STOPFORD, and JAMES W. KAVANAGH, Esq., in *The Morning News*, in reference to ARCHDEACON STOPFORD'S PAMPHLET UPON "THE CATHOLIC CASE STATED."

To the Venerable EDWARD A. STOPFORD, Protestant Archbishop of Meath.

VERY REV. SIR,—That you should come to the rescue of the National system, in its present hour of need, does not surprise me. An active propagandist to proselytise Catholics, you now are, clearly, that no scheme yet devised, for this purpose, in Ireland, has produced such hopeful results, as the National system. Therefore, you not only warn the Protestant clergy, against aiding in its overthrow, but you entreat the Catholics to it, to reconsider whether the National system may not be made more effective than any other agency, in diffusing a knowledge of the Protestant Scriptures, amongst Catholics.

Your letter to the Right Hon. A. Macdonnell, in reply to "The Catholic Case Stated," opens with the following passage—"Mr. James Kavanagh's book on National Education contains a misrepresentation of transactions between me and the Board of Education in Ireland, which I feel called on, publicly, to correct. I refer to the explanation of the Rule on which the question turned, whether a patron was bound himself to remove children from religious instruction, or only to permit parents to withdraw them." Now, sir, while declaring that I do not believe you would write that which you knew to be false, I must state that, as you had my book before you, I am wholly unable to account for the serious charge of misrepresentation here made. You have not even followed up the charge, by a specific statement of the precise nature of the alleged misrepresentation, still less have you proved that any exists. In the many charges which for years you yourself brought against the Commissioners, you always extended to them the advantage of a clear statement, and, on many grounds, I claim, no say right, the same treatment, in this your first charge against me.

The matter of alleged misrepresentation is hastily shrouded over, and your pamphlet, an, contains many statements which must damage not only the tottering institution which you now support, but it cannot advance your own reputation. At page 21, you state—"In Mr. Kavanagh's present position towards the Board, the exhibition of personal feeling can only weaken his statements. This mistake should have been corrected in the revision. The 'duplicité, untruth, and dishonesty, on the part of the authorities in Malborough-street' (p. 117), . . . cannot have much

weight with any who have been in communication with your Board, and with its officers." Now, sir, you have unfairly garbled this extract, as it is "evidence"—official, documentary proof—of those views that are expressly referred to, in the note from which you quote. I there advance no charge that I have not proved, and proved apart altogether from my own testimony. One other witness I shall call to sustain the charges—one who, when he gave his evidence, had, for some time, been in active correspondence with the Board, and I now leave the readers of your letters to the Resident Commissioner to determine what weight, sir, is to be attached to the testimony of the new witness. The gentleman, now a P. P. O., and to a P. P. by post, after minute and careful examination of the rules, reports, and working of the National system, published the result of his investigation, in three separate pamphlets—one, a report to his own father, a Most Rev. prelate; one, a letter to the Lord Lieutenant; and one, correspondence with the National Board. In each of these pamphlets, the ground charges are preferred against the Commissioners; and, on the occasion of his applying for aid to a National school, a special meeting was called to consider this strange proceeding, when the Board, conveyed to that gentleman the indignant reply, from which the following extract is copied—

"Education Office, 29th March, 1848.

"Sir,—Your Letter affords ground, in one part of it, for inferring, or at least for suspecting, that it would be in your opinion, not altogether unprofitable for a person to receive a grant from the Board, while availing his objections to some of the Rules, and denouncing, afterwards, to disprove them in practice."

"The Commissioners therefore, find that they can not participate in any and without co-operation from you in the management of any National School, but rather remain distant, continued disputes, and, perhaps, troublesome litigation; and this feeling is strengthened by the circumstances of your having spoken, in a Pamphlet, issued to the Commissioners, conducted the most dangerous and false."

"No confidence, whatever, can reasonably be felt in the persons on whom such imputations are liberally cast, or in the number of such imputations, if they are possible. On either supposition, therefore, it is most infelicitous that parties so unscrupulous should have any dealings together."

"The Commissioners accordingly direct us to say that, if

you wish to have a National School established for the benefit of your tenantry, the application must be made, and the whole management of it conducted, by some other persons, between whom and the Commissioners the requisite degree of mutual confidence and sincere co-operation may reasonably be hoped for.

(Signed)

"MAYNARD CRAIG."  
"JAMES KILPATRICK."

Reverend Sir, this most serious letter was written—not to a Catholic Inspector, on resigning his office for conscience' sake, but to the *Reverend Edward A. Staggford*, Protestant Archbishop of *Moath*, and was the solemn decision—not of Catholics, but of the *Right Hon. A. Macdonnell*, to whom your present letter is addressed; of Archbishop Whately (Chairman); Rev. Dr. Saffier, Provost of Trinity College; the Marquis of Kildare, Baron Grosvenor, and the Rev. Dr. Haury; the only Catholic Commissioner present being His Grace Archbishop Murray. Since you wrote these pamphlets, which thus prescribed you from becoming the patron of any National school, you have never once apologized for, or explained the grave mistakes which led to this most offensive letter to you from the Commissioners. On the contrary, after your connection with the Board, you distinctly, and, I must say, bravely, submit a justification, in your pamphlet of 1847 (page 39, and Appendix B), of those grave imputations of "forever-*ing* loyalty," as the Rev. Dr. Elington called one of your charges, and "conduct most dangerous and base," as the Commissioners themselves regarded those charges generally. If you had addressed yourself, sir, to the task of impeaching the evidence upon which I prove the charges of "duplicity, untruth, and dishonesty," against the Board, it would be eligible and becoming, but, unless you do so, silence is your bounden duty.

Again, sir, you state, the "terrific, the ever-dropping, the backstairs intrigues, the bullying, the bribing, the general corruption of the whole inspection staff (p. 338, "Catholic Case")—of whom Mr. Kavanagh appears rather to have failed in taking the food—cannot have much weight with any who have been in communication with your Board and with its officers."

When you wrote that passage you were fully aware that the statement by me referred solely to the internal economy and discipline of the staff, and, therefore, that your opinion upon the subject, as that of one wholly ignorant of the question, was worthless. You knew nothing—you could know nothing, sir, about it. The only inspectors ever officially connected with you were Messrs. Coyle, Clarke, Newell, Hunter, Fitzgibbon, Conwell, and myself. Some of these you may never have met—as no patron in Ireland has, for some years back, given much less attention to his schools than you have done—and you slight knowledge of these few—of a large staff of officers—could, in no way, enable you to offer any opinion, whatever, upon the internal government and official direction of a corps of seventy officers.

Several of your observations, personal to me, are unwarranted, ungenerous, and unjust. Thus, in the passage last quoted, you intimate that I was an applicant—as no trial, no tribute—for the leadership of the inspection staff, and this intimation you make, in the face of my specific refutation of the same calumny by the Resident Commissioner, given in my book, p. 428. Your friend, the Resident Commissioner, if he told you any of the whole truth, should have informed you that on mentioning to me, in 1856, that such a leadership was about to be created, he added, "Allow me to do this now; give no opposition, and it will be your turn next. You evidence, but you, have made such means of the Protestant here, and in England, against you, that although you are the man that should be appointed, it would be highly dangerous to take such a step now." Motives were attributed to you, sir, when, from being the most violent clerical opponent of the National system, you suddenly turned round in December, 1846, just as the Peel Ministry went out (July, 1846), which had given your father the Bishops of Moath, and yourself, through him, a living of £1,800 a year; and you were charged, by your own

clergy, with seeing a mitre through the vista which led to Tyrone House. Defending yourself against such a charge, you merely state:—"But I cannot see why a man's personal or private motives should be examined, to find explanation of his conduct, when he puts forward reasons which many just and upright men feel to be of great weight."—(Letter upon Non-Vested Schools, p. 39). I beg, sir, to remind you that in voluntarily withdrawing from the service of the National Board, I had no future upon which to fall back, no political or party motive to hurl myself in, no real educational intimation to bid for any services. If I was grossly treated, it was only temporary, and my restoration to my former position, as Head Inspector, was certain, and, as I was assured, would be immediate. Every consideration of self-interest, association, and personal gratitude, dictated to me to remain—deterred me from resigning. A good Providence has blessed my labours, and I shall never cease until the Catholics of Ireland obtain a Catholic system of education. Personal abuse, misrepresentation, calumny, only strengthen our cause. The victory is in the hands of the Catholic prelates and people, and your pamphlet and all such productions, will most likely promote the very and they were desired to frustrate.

You assure, sir, to know what portions of my book were written by myself, and what by others. You state:—"The style of the book justifies its use of the editorial 'We'—a clear and forcible style on those topics which Mr. Kavanagh can have least studied, and of which he would least be permitted to treat, stands in contrast with the confused and ungrammatical structure of sentences in other places." This, sir, is the pedant's reply to "The Catholic Case," but unfortunately, no doubt, you complain both my Church and myself. I have been permitted to write upon every subject discussed in the book, I have given much attention to the topics to which you refer, and the clear and forcible style, no less than the alleged loose and ungrammatical structure of sentences, elsewhere—contrast, though they be, in your judgment—one by one and the same hand. You now must see, either that you rashly decide upon insufficient evidence, or, that your opinion, sir, is of comparatively little value.

In the opening of your letter the following passage occurs:—

"In page 95 of his book, Mr. Kavanagh cites me to prove that the rule [as to the obligation or non-obligation of patrons to remove Catholic children from Protestant religious instruction] before its amendment, required of the patron to exclude. I cannot prove this for him, for, in the very words he quotes, I stated, as I always had done, that 'it was capable of either construction.' I never asked for anything respecting this rule but for the removal of an ambiguity."

I have already made you prove this, sir, but, if, in your opinion, I have failed, I shall bring you again upon the table, and make you prove it, by new evidence. I am bound to say, sir, that a more sincere and inaccurate statement I have never read than your present account of the change of rule 3, section 2, effected, at your instance, in 1847. Writing about the change, at the close of 1847, just after it had been effected, you state, in a letter to the Protestant clergy of the diocese of Moath, written and published with the approbation of the Bishop, your father:—

"The Board had themselves raised the question" [as to the interpretation of the rule]. "They had formerly gone beyond the most objectionable sense of this rule. They had affirmed that it was of the essence of these rules" [these italics copied from your own pamphlet] "that the patron should exclude from religious instruction all who were not actually directed by their parents to remain. (Letter on the Temple Mount home school). And, when a proposition for and to a school ('the Convent,' see Sixth Report), in terms corresponding to the favourable construction of this rule, was put before them, they re-published, as being substantially the same, that letter to the Temple Mount school, putting in italics the most objectionable parts." With your own pamphlet before you, published in 1847, containing (page 16) these clear statements, I am astonished, sir, at the assertions

APPENDIX,  
No. 18.

Appendix,  
No. 12.

made in your letter to Mr. Macdonnell. Against this interpretation, as placed upon the rule by the Board, you thus strongly and solemnly protest, on your own behalf, and on that of the Protestant clergy.—

"To us [the Protestant clergy] the difference of interpretation, as point of principle, was very great."

"We cannot carry into effect the parent's prohibition. This we cannot do." "We cannot undertake to perform [a wrong act] for the parent."

"We feel bound to leave a child's religious instruction in the hands of his parent, although he abuse it; we cannot make the abuse our own act."

This was one of "the two things we judged essential," had they then (in 1844) been granted to us, we remained separate; having (in 1847) obtained, we accept them; were they not granted, we should yet remain apart."

I have, sir, quoted quite enough to satisfy you that you can prove for me—that you have proved for me, "that the rule (3, section 2) before its amendment (in 1847) required the parents to exclude" the children from any religious instruction different from that which they professed. You obtained the change—a substitutive, a radical change—of the rule, which, in justice to you, I call the *Stepford pre-promulgatory rule*. In so doing I mean no disrespect, nor could you feel that the amendment of your name with an instrument potent, beyond all your representations, in securing the attendance of Catholic children at Protestant Bible-reading can be imputed to you, or, as a reproach.

You would, however, most kindly share the honour of the change of rule with me, but, as the imputation came from *THEIR* House, the censure will be short-lived. I went as Inspector to Carron, Meath, and Westmeath, in January, 1845, and was stationed in Virginia, in 1845 and 1846. I had the pleasure of accidentally meeting you on three occasions only—in two National schools, and in the Oldcastle schools. On 2nd December, 1846, the last of these occasions, you asked me to obtain an official answer to the question put by you—"Are we to regard the non-vested system of schools as a temporary measure to the vestal, to be discarded when its foster-child can go alone?" I transcribe my reply to you, as published in your own pamphlet in 1847.—

"Education Office, 14th January, 1847.

"*Rev. Sir*—(Having had some conversation with you on a recent occasion, in Carron National School-house, with reference to the intention of the Board on the subject of vested schools, and desiring to procure an official answer to your inquiries on the subject, I laid the matter before the Commissioners, and beg leave to submit a copy of their reply to any letter on the subject.)—

"Your letter of the 3th instant having been laid before the Board, we are directed to inform you that the Commissioners have no intention to separate gradually, at convenient times, all non-vested schools, by establishing vested ones in their vicinity; but they do not consider it compatible with their duties to give specific pledges to any individuals who may wish to put schools under the Board."

"Dated, 22nd December, 1846."

"I remain, *Reverend Sir*, your obedient servant,

"JAMES W. KAVANAGH,

"General Inspector of National Schools.

"Archdeacon Stepford."

Between the date of your question and that of my letter, I was promoted from the rank of District, to that of General Inspector, and my official connection with your locality soon after ceased. In April, 1847, at your request, and decreed by the National Board, I went down, from Dublin, to conduct, for a few hours, a public examination of your *non-National* school, at Kells. At the close of August, 1847, you wrote to me to send you the usual printed form of application, upon which to apply for aid to your schools. Your first application, in September, failed, but, at length, you succeeded in removing, by a slight verbal alteration, the original rule, against which you so strongly protested, and had substituted that which so justly bears your name. Call it verbal alteration, or, as I call it, the mere substitution of the particle "to," it was, practically, the *total* subversion of Lord Stanley's

system. I was the means of procuring, as was my duty, this official answer to your inquiry, as to the Board's intentions towards the foster-children—the non-vested schools; and this, you state, led to your removing your lapard, and interdicted relations with the Board. With the second question—the change of rule—I had no official connection whatever. You assert that the explanations afforded to you, which led to your being brought a second time into communication with the Board, were obtained through me. This statement, sir, is contrary to fact. I obtained but one explanation for you—that in reference to non-vested schools, and that was obtained at your own instance—it had no connection whatever with the change of rule, nor did you take any step towards putting yourself in communication with the Board for eight months afterwards, during which period, and for some years subsequent, I was assiduously unconnected with your schools and with the district. To state, as you do, that it was I who brought you a second time into communication with the Board, on the subject of the rule which was then changed (letter, p. 7), is not only destitute of truth, but I call upon you, and, as a clergyman, I expect you to, at once, either prove your statement or retract it. I demand, sir, a clear, plain, unequivocal answer upon this simple, but important matter. In order to help your memory, and, as I have no desire to exhibit you to the public in any more unfavourable light than you have already placed yourself, I beg, sir, to submit copies of the following letters to me, previous to your application for aid for your schools.—

"The Archdeacon of Meath hopes Mr. Kavanagh may be able to fill his kind promise of conducting an examination of his school at Kells. The Archdeacon would be greatly obliged by his valuable assistance. Lord Howland being in Kells on the 12th of April, the Archdeacon would like, if possible, to have the examination some day of the latter end of the week preceding that day. Should this not be convenient to Mr. K., the Archdeacon would fix some later day which might suit Mr. Kavanagh."

"Archdeaconry, Meath, March 31st, 1847."

The following note proves, that from the date of that examination, held only in April, 1847, up to August 24, you had neither met me nor written to me, my official connection with the district having wholly ceased.—

"The Archdeacon of Meath would be much obliged by Mr. Kavanagh's sending *some form of application for aid for his school at Kells, not also for his sister school*."

"The Archdeacon registered not having had the pleasure of meeting Mr. K. again, after the examination of the school at Kells, to thank him for his services. The Archdeacon would feel much pleasure in having the advantage of Mr. Kavanagh's inspection in future."

"Archdeaconry, Kells, Aug. 24th, 1847."

The forms of application were sent to you. Mr. Clarke, the District Inspector, visited and reported upon the cases, and I now, again, demand that you will prove your assertions that it was explanations—amongst others of the *Rule* in question—obtained by me from the Board, which brought you a second time into this communication with the Commissioners. I pronounce it an unqualified non-statement, for which you had no warranty, and I require you, sir, to either publicly prove it or publicly retract it. That I volunteered any office for you, or any interference beyond the strict requirements of my duty as a public officer, is not correct, as the terms of my first letter, of January, 1847, clearly prove. The explanation, rather assurance, in that letter is the only one obtained through me—that in reference to non-vested schools; the subsequent explanation of the rule was effected through your own direct correspondence with the Commissioners, and without any official interference whatever on my part. Page 12 of your own pamphlet, written immediately after your joining the Board in 1847, designed to set forth a minute account of the particulars of that connection, states:—

"There were two points—the permanence of the non-vested system, and the limitation of the obligations respecting religious instruction—which we formerly thought essential to our acting with the

Board. And this was not a hasty or changeable conclusion."

The former of these I had explained for you through my letter, and to which you refer (page 7 of your pamphlet) as "an unimportant no less important than satisfactory," and (page 3) that the previous "refusal of this explanation made the impediment insurmountable," of connecting your schools with the Board. Here, sir, is the truth, in your own words, as given in 1847, your present version of it in one instance of yours, although undesignated misrepresentation. I obtained one explanation for you, which led to your sending direct correspondence with the Board; you, yourself, through that direct correspondence, obtained the other—namely, the alteration of part of a rule, from "That no child be compelled to receive, or be present at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object" to "That no child be compelled to receive or to be present at," &c.—the latter being totally and radically different from the other. The former required the Protestant parent to exclude a Catholic child from being present at Protestant religious instruction, the latter merely prohibits him from compelling the Catholic child to receive, and from compelling the Catholic child to be present at such instruction, but if they attend, so unfortunately they do, in tens of thousands, at such test schools, no rule of the system is now violated. Here, sir, is the simple history of the two stages in your evasions, from the position of official officer, when the Peel Ministry was in office, in March, 1845, to your settlement in the land of promise, October, 1847, when the Russell Government was restored.

There are many most serious errors, viz. in your pamphlet, for several of which I am unable to account. You quote this passage from my book—"Archdeacon Stopped and the Protestant clergy sought the change in the rule, and he at once availed himself of it for the purpose of proselytism, as appeared from his evidence in 1844," and, thereupon, you observe—"I think it due to myself to state that this is totally untrue and unfounded. I never asked a Roman Catholic to send his child to my school, nor a Roman Catholic child to attend. These Roman Catholics who sent their children to my school were not in my employment, nor, so far as I know, in the employment of any Protestant." Now, sir, your own evidence is quoted by me—"Every Roman Catholic child (from two, at one time, to seven or eight at another) who has ever come to the school, has always attended the religious instruction, consisting of reading and explaining the Scriptures." I have made no comment, and, therefore, your statement is unwarranted and offensive, as even Mr. Macdonnell, to whom your letter is addressed, assumes in, on oath, "that any system of schools that renders it necessary for the children attending those schools to read the Protestant Bible, may be considered proselytism. I look upon it," he says, "that the great and vital distinction between Protestant and Roman Catholics is involved in the indiscriminate reading of the Bible." Equally unfounded is your own statement, that the parents of none of the Catholic children in your school were in Protestant employment, as, from my notes, I find that three of the Catholic children who had been in your National schools belonged to your own best, named Chisney. In the postscript of your pamphlet you innocently contradicted my assertion that, on the 17th February, 1844, I had examined your schools, saying, "It was on the 10th that Mr. Kavanagh visited my school." You have two schools, sir, and I refer to both, while you appear to contradict me, but do not do so in reality. I examined your schools both on the 10th and on the 17th February, 1844. Again, there is another equally unmeaning statement, in which you evidently intended to impute an inconsistency, or a contradiction against me, but which is wholly destitute of point. In quoting from my evidence, in your postscript, you omit to inform the reader that it is in reference to apostasy or perversion I am asked, and surely you do not accuse me of wrong, because I stated on oath that I had never heard of a

single case of apostasy amongst the children in your school. The three negative answers given to Lord Harrowby's questions (2732-3-4), denying that I had ever known or heard of any case of proselytism in a National school, are as clear as light, and specifically refer—questions and answers—to cases of open apostasy, not of all to mere proselytizing practices, such as are now common, unfortunately, in most Protestant National schools attended by Catholics.—

2752.—Have you heard, in the course of your inspection, any complaint that proselytism has been the result of mixed education?—I have never heard of an instance in which it could be traced to that cause alone.

2753. You have never heard of the sympathy of a mother, which has been spoken of as having existed along the same way?—No, I am not aware of any such instance. I do not know of any instance of a change of religion happening to any of the children, in a mixed school, where it could be traced to the influence of the schools.

2754. Or in which clergymen, of either religious persuasion, have come to you with the complaint that the children have been drawn away through the influence of the school?—No, I never heard of a single instance.

Now, unless, sir, some of your Catholic pupils become apostates, and that I had known this, in 1844, when I gave that evidence, there is neither point nor force in your reference to my answers, now quoted. The Earl of Harrowby meant apostasy on *personis* view, and in most explicit terms I testified in the same sense.

Your entire statement, sir, in reference to the educational claims of Catholics, is founded on misapprehension. My book nowhere asks that the priest shall have more legal power in the school than he has in the church. He cannot legally compel any Catholic parent or child to go to the parish chapel, nor do we ask that he shall be invested with legal power to compel any child to go to the parish school.

There is no one of your adverse strictures, sir, of any moment to which I have not now replied; the only other one to which you could, by possibility, attach any importance being that in reference to a sentence in my paper read at the British Association, and which, as it has been alluded to in other letters, I shall elsewhere notice.

There are several other Protestant dignitaries who may yet come out upon the subject of National Education. Denis Hoare, for whom Mr. Macdonnell states he has already written one pamphlet, has not yet appeared, and, doubtless, several other episcopal leaders may yet, like you, assure the Resident Commissioner that their pamphlet was not written to order; but, reversed sir, I happen to know, and am, any day, enlightening the Irish public how these matters are managed.

Upon the following points I demand, sir, distinct and explicit answers.—

Whether I obtained any explanation whatever for you from the Board, except the assurance contained in my letter, above quoted, previous to your entering into direct communication with the Commissioners for aid to your schools? I emphatically, sir, deny that I did, and as I had never seen you, nor written to you, nor held any communication whatever with you, from the beginning of April, until you first applied to put your schools under the Board, any statement to the contrary must be false.

Next, I deny that I had any official connexion whatever with the discussion of the change of rule, which was conducted exclusively between yourself and the Commissioners, through direct correspondence, none of which passed through my hands. I challenge you to disprove this statement.

Lastly, any statement that I may have made as to my agency in effecting your junction with the Board must have been made mainly in reference to the state of moral and official outlawry in which I found you, in 1846, and the facilities which my knowledge of my business, and my courtesy afforded you, in effecting that junction.

I am, reverend sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES W. KAVANAGH.

2nd June, 1859.

Appendix,  
No. 19.

## APPENDIX No. XIX.

PAPERS connected with the INCORPORATED SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING ENGLISH PROTESTANT SCHOOLS in IRELAND, referred to as Papers No. 1 and No. 2, in the Statement handed in as Evidence by Rev. JOHN WINTERBURN, Secretary to the Society.

[See page 1147, 1st column.]

## PAPER No. 1.

Qualifications which the Schools are required to possess.	Names of Schools.	Description.	No. of Boarders, male.	Free Pupils.	No. of Day Pupils.	Names and Addresses of Principals.
ARTIST.	Enniscorthy, Enniscorthy.	Day School.	—	—	40	Rev. W. H. Macdonald, Dublin.
DUBLIN.	Travelling Commercial and Scientific Institution, near Sarsfield.	Boys' Boarding School.	10	18	none	Mr. W. H. Engle, J.A., Travelling Institution, Sarsfield.
DUBLIN.	English Commercial and Scientific School, 44, Annesborough Street, Dublin.	Boys' Day School.	none	none	32 to 35	Mr. J. de Glerville, 44, Annesborough Street, Dublin.
DUNDALK.	Day School.	Elementary Day School for Boys and Girls.	none	none	140 to 150	Mr. Thomas Farnham, Day School, Dundalk.
DUBLIN.	Kilbuckley School.	Day School.	—	—	50	Rev. and Mrs. H. Ward, Dublin.
KILBURN.	Chelmsford Institution.	Female Boarding School.	42	none	none	Mrs. Crawford, Incorporated Society's Institution, Chelmsford.
KILBURN.	Powder Institution, near Kilmacree.	Boys' Boarding School.	25	24	none	Mr. J. B. Brown, Powder Institution, Kilmacree.
LOUTH.	Edinburgh Institution, Dundalk.	Boys' Boarding and Day School.	44	44	16	Mr. John Turner, Edinburgh Institution, Dundalk.
MEATH.	Trinity School.	Boys' Day School.	none	none	21	Mr. W. P. Lowe, Kinn.
QUEEN'S CO.	Stratfield School.	Elementary Day School for Boys and Girls.	none	none	94	Mr. John Reed, Stratfield.
ROBINSON.	Sancti Spiritus Institution, Athlone.	Boys' Boarding and Day School.	50	40	14	Mr. J. Macdonald, Sancti Spiritus Institution, Athlone.
ROBINSON.	St. Peter's School, Athlone.	Day School (Boys and Girls).	—	—	40	Rev. James O'Leary, Athlone, Co. Wick.
ROBINSON.	Sancti Spiritus Institution, Kesh.	Female Boarding School.	50	12	none	Mrs. Crawford, Sancti Spiritus Institution, Kesh.
SLIGO.	Princess Grace Institution, Rathfriland.	Boys' Boarding and Day School.	50	18	16	Mr. George H. Macdonald, Princess Grace Institution, Rathfriland.
TIFFIN.	Chelmsford School.	Boys' Day School.	none	none	24	Rev. F. E. Brady, Chelmsford, Co. Wick.
TIFFIN.	Catholic School (A).	Boys' and Girls' School.	none	none	40	The Dean of Cahir, Fermoy.
TIFFIN.	St. John's School.	Elementary Day School for Boys and Girls.	none	none	12	At present (1862) closed.
TIFFIN.	St. John's College, Newport.	Boys' Day School.	none	none	16	Mr. J. Cox, Newport.
TIFFIN.	St. John's College, Newport.	Boys' Boarding and Day School.	none	29	16	Mr. J. L. Whitty, St. John's College, Newport, Tipperary.
WATERFORD.	Farm Institution.	Boys' Boarding School.	20	12	none	Mr. J. D. Collins, Farm School, Bandon, Waterford.
WATERFORD.	Artisan School.	Boys' Day School.	none	none	25	Rev. W. G. Brady, Waterford.

As the numbers given above are those which the Schools can comfortably accommodate. The number of Free Pupils is fixed in each case. Pay Boarders and Day Pupils vary in number at different times.

## BOARDING INSTITUTIONS.

A limited number of boys are annually elected to free places on the foundation of the Society, and are thereonward lodged, clothed, and educated during five years (unless removed for misconduct) without expense to parents or friends. At the termination of this period, each boy vacates his scholarship, in order to make room for a newly elected candidate, and comes to have any further claim on the Society, except for a testimonial of character, in case he shall have proved himself entitled to it.

None.—The only exception to this rule is in the case of re-election to the Society Training Commercial and Scientific Institution, subsequently elected to it.

Boys are elected by competitive examination, conducted by a deputation from the Society, who attend for the purpose at the several institutions and schools on certain days (in June or July each year), of which due notice is given to all persons interested in the matter.

Candidates are examined in the Book of Genesis, the first twenty chapters of Exodus, the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles; the Church Catechism and the Scriptural references showing its doctrine to be in conformity with the Word of God, reading, writing, the rudiments of English grammar, the geography of Europe, Palestine, and Asia Minor, and in arithmetic, as far as the Rule of Three inclusive, and vulgar and decimal fractions. The examinations are conducted with the strictest impartiality, and the best answers selected.

With reference to the examinations, the following rules are strictly observed:—

1. Candidates shall not be under twelve, nor above sixteen years of age.
2. Candidates must have been in attendance at a Scriptural school within prescribed districts for at least one year previous to the day of examination.

3. Certificates of age and moral conduct, signed by the clergyman of the parish in which the candidate has been educated, as also of health, signed by a medical practitioner, must be produced previous to the examination.

[illegible]

4. Certificates are received only on the Society's printed forms, which can be obtained on application to the respective masters at the institutions.

3. The number of candidates in each case must be at least three times that of the vacancies to be filled; when this does not occur, the scholarships are given only in that proportion, and the Society confer the remainder upon deserving but unsuccessful candidates at other institutions.

6. When two brothers are candidates at the same examination, only one of them can be elected, if the next year on the examination list be found duly qualified.

Electoral fundations are required to have, on their admission, each—one jacket, one waistcoat, one pair of trousers, one pair of shoes, one cap, two shirts, and two pair of stockings—all in good repair.

To the **Precincts Institution**, near Kilkenny.—From the Counties of Kilkenny and Waterford, and the Parish of Derrin, Queen's County; from the City and County of Cork, and from the County of Kerry.

Districts—  
Privileged to  
supply Candidates.

To the Rosalagh Institution, Athlone—From the towns of Athlone and Roscommon, and the Counties of Roscommon and Galway.

To the Princess George Institution, near Sligo.—From the Town and County of Sligo, and seven bordering Parishes in the County of Mayo, also from Achill

To the Ferra Institution, near Mullingar.—From the Coralline of Westmeath and Meath.

Henry School  
—co-education.

A proportion of the scholars who have completed the term of four years in the above-named Institutions are annually re-elected for an additional period to the Society's Training, Commercial and Scientific Institutions at Buxley, near Dublin (if after examination and inquiry as to character, they shall appear deserving of such distinction), where an opportunity is afforded of continuing and extending those studies in which, as a necessary qualification for such re-election, they must have already made considerable progress.

N.B.—Boys are also elected to the Searcy Institution from the day school, 55, Aungmye-street, Dublin. The foregoing Institutions afford a sound Scriptural and superior English, commercial, and mathematical education, calculated to fit young men for the offices of schoolmasters, accountants, assistants to civil engineers, and for commercial pursuits generally.

Educationally  
afforded.

The Theology Exhibition in Trinity College, Dublin, of the annual value of £30, and tenable for four years, is open to the pupils of all schools under the Incorporated Society.

Each Institution has the advantage of frequent visitation by the minister of the parish, or other neighbouring clergyman, the paid officer of the Incorporated Society, by whom the pupils are regularly catechised and instructed in the Holy Scriptures.

Thickening  
Exhalation.  
Catechism.

Boys are received as boarders, irrespective of locality, and without any preliminary literary examination. They enjoy all the educational advantages above referred to, and are comfortably clothed and lodged, washed for, and supplied with stationery and medical attendance, at £20 each per annum.

Pay (Half)  
 Borders  
 Taxes

Day pupils can also be received at the Institutions, and instructed in English and mathematics at £3 per annum each.

Dear Paula,

The masters are at liberty to provide instruction in classics, modern languages, drawing, &c., for pupils whose friends desire to afford them such advantages: the *honoris* *laurea* is also conferred.

## References

The dietary appointed for boys on the foundation and for pay (hall) boarders, in the several institutions, is as follows:—

Dietary

Breakfast, daily—Strawberry or bread, and new milk.

Dinner, 3 days in each week.—Fresh beef or mutton.

2	3	"	"	—Soup, seasoned and thickened with vegetables,	} with potatoes or bread.
"	1	"	"	—Bacon and greens,	

The several masters are permitted to receive parlour boarders, on terms to be arranged with the friends of the pupils.

Parlous  
Dreadful

Boys are received as boarders, if under the age of fourteen, at 40 guineas per annum.

St. John's  
College, Texas

"	"	"	If above	"	"	45	"	"
"	"	"	day pupils	"	"	10 to 12	"	"
Modern languages, drawing, stationary and washing extra.								

A limited number of girls are annually elected to free places on the foundation of the Colledge and Rosemary female boarding institutions, where they remain during four years (unless removed for misconduct), and are dressed, clothed, and educated without expense to parents or friends. At the termination of the period each girl vacates her place in the institution, in order to make room for a newly-elected candidate, and ceases to have any further claim on the Society, except for a testimonial of character and conduct, in case she shall have proved herself duly entitled to it.

Quesada  
Foundation  
Donor's Request

Only one elected by competitive examination, conducted by a deputation from the Society, who attend for the purpose on certain days, in June or July each year, of which due notice is given to all persons interested in the matter.

Downloaded from  
http://ajph.org/

The candidates are examined in spelling, reading, and writing, and in St. Matthew's Gospel, together with the Church Catechism and the Scriptural references showing its doctrines to be in conformity with the Word of God—the examinations are conducted with the utmost impartiality, and the best answers elected.

### References

1. Candidates shall not be under ten nor above fourteen years of age.
2. Candidates must have been in attendance at a Scriptural school within prescribed districts, for at least six years previous to the day of examination.

Las Vegas

10. Certificates of age, attendance at school, and moral conduct, signed by the diangymist of the parish, as to health, signed by a medical practitioner of the neighbourhood, must be produced previous to the vaccination.

4. Certificates will be received only on the Society's printed forms, which may be obtained on application at the Institution.

4 The number of candidates in each case must be at least twice that of the vacancies to be filled. When it does not occur, the vacant places are given only in that proportion.

Boarding  
Institutions  
—  
Girls  
—  
Education  
—  
Candidates  
—  
Dormitory  
—  
Permitted to  
apply  
Candidates

6. In cases where two sisters are candidates at the same examination, one of them only can be elected, if the next girl in the examination list be found duly qualified.

The Cefbridge and Roscommon Institutions afford a sound Scriptural and useful English education; the children are also instructed in needle-work, and in domestic employments, including the care of the house, management of the dairy, laundry, &c.

As in the case of the boys' boarding institutions, the pupils enjoy the advantage of regular Scriptural instruction from clergymen who act as catechists, and are the paid officers of the Incorporated Society.

Candidates are eligible to the respective foundations from the Scriptural schools of the following districts:—

To the Cefbridge Institution.—From the Counties of Kildare, Wicklow, Meath, and Westmeath, and the following parishes in the County of Dublin:—

Newman.	Castleknock.	Chapelstead.	Bartholomew.
Tallaght.	Malahide.	Palmstown.	Saggart.
Clonsilla.	Clonsilla.	Ballyhenry.	Finglas.
Kilbarrack.	Sandy.	Lough.	Glasnevin.
Kilbride.	Clonsilla.	Lough and Esker.	Brinsford.

To the Runglish Institution, Roscommon.—From the Towns of Athlone and Roscommon, and County of Roscommon, Galway, and Sligo.

Pay Boarders  
Terms

The Roscommon Female Institution affords accommodation for a limited number of children, when the mistress is permitted to receive no pay boarders.—Terms, which are moderate, and according to age, may be known on application to the mistress, at the institution.

Day Schools  
—  
Education

#### DAY SCHOOLS.

The education afforded in the day schools (with the exception of the Augustine school, Dublin, subsequently referred to) is of an elementary character. In order to encourage these schools, and stimulate the exertions of both teachers and pupils, the latter (under the prescribed conditions as to age, attainments, and attendance at school) are eligible as candidates for free scholarships on the foundation of the Society's Institutions.

Terms

In general the teachers are allowed to receive a small payment from children whose friends are averse to pay for their education, the poorer children being free.

Dublin Day  
School, 15,  
Augustine street  
Scholarships

This school provides a sound Scriptural and excellent English, Commercial, and Mathematical education.

A competitive examination is held annually for a scholarship in the Society Training Commercial and Scientific Institution; while in that institution the successful candidate is maintained, clothed, and educated at the expense of the Incorporated Society.

Terms.

Fee for English and science course, £4 per annum.

French, German, Italian, and Latin (if required), each £1 per annum.

It is the earnest desire of the Incorporated Society that their institutions and schools should be visited, and that the several public examinations of the pupils and of candidates for free scholarships should be witnessed by patrons of schools, by the clergy of the various districts, by parents and school-teachers, and by all persons who take an interest in the improvement and welfare of the rising generation.

By order,

INCORPORATED SOCIETY'S OFFICE,  
73, HARROGATE STREET, DUBLIN.

JOHN W. HACKETT, A.M., CL.,  
Secretary.

#### PAPER No. 2.

*Form of Certificate required by the Incorporated Society, from Candidates presenting themselves for admission on the Foundation of their Institutions.*

I certify that \_\_\_\_\_ aged \_\_\_\_\_ Years and \_\_\_\_\_ Months, attended \_\_\_\_\_ School, where the Holy Scriptures are daily read by all the Children who can read, during the last twelve months, and that \_\_\_\_\_ conduct was satisfactory.

Minister of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_, 18\_\_\_\_.

I have examined the above named \_\_\_\_\_ and consider \_\_\_\_\_ to be of sound bodily health.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Medical Practitioner.

\_\_\_\_\_, 18\_\_\_\_.

To the Master or Mistress of \_\_\_\_\_ Institution.

You will please receive the above-named \_\_\_\_\_ on the Foundation of the Incorporated Society.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date.